

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

CONTENTS

	PAGE
KRAPPE, A. H.—'Antipodes,'	441
DABNEY, L. E.—An Anonymous Sixteenth Century French Play on the Death of Lucretia,	448
SPITZER, LEO.—'Comme quoi,'	454
EOFF, SHERMAN.—A Phase of Pereda's Writings in Imitation of Balzac,	460
AUSTIN, H. D.—Beatrice's Eyes,	466
AUSTIN, H. D.—"Sounding Brass,"	468
LIEVSAY, J. L.—An Immediate Source for <i>Faerie Queene</i> , Bk. V, Proem,	469
SMITH, R. M.—More Irish Words in Spenser,	472
ALLEN, R. B.—'Wad,'	478
MOORE, A. K.—Alysoun's Other Tonne,	481
LEVI DELLA VIDA, G.—"Chrestiens de la saincture,"	484
LEVY, RAPHAEL.—'La Vie de Saint Thomas Becket,' vers 1341,	487
HAM, E. B.—Readings from 'Parise la Duchesse,'	490
ALLEN, D. C.—George Herbert's 'Sycomore,'	493
MANNING, C. A.—Shevchenko and Pushkin's 'To the Slanderers of Russia,'	495

REVIEWS:—

E. V. K. DOBBIN (ed.), <i>The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems</i> . [F. P. Magoun, Jr.]	497
R. E. CLARK and L. POSTON, JR., <i>French Syntax List</i> . [Anna G. Hatcher.]	502
K. B. WALLACE, Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric. [F. R. Johnson.]	505
C. O. WILLIAMS, <i>Thralldom in Ancient Iceland</i> . [L. M. Hollander.]	507
S. L. SUMBERG, <i>The Nuremberg Schembart Carnival</i> . [Carl Selmer.]	508
J. A. HILLER, <i>Albrecht von Eyb, Medieval Moralist</i> . [Carl Selmer.]	509

BRIEF MENTION: <i>The Canadian Modern Language Review</i> ; A. C. WARD, A Literary Journey through Wartime Britain,	510
---	-----

CORRESPONDENCE: <i>Variorum Spenser, Minor Poems</i> ; Some Notes on Otfrid's <i>Ad Lieutbertum</i> ,	511
---	-----

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive).

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
RAYMOND D. HAVENS
KEMP MALONE

C. S. SINGLETON
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB*, *JEGP*, *MLN*, *MLR*, *MP*, *NED*, *PMLA*, *PQ*, *RR*, *SP*, *RES*, *TLS*. Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

Of Course, You Can't Be There—But—

NO, you can't be there at the dressing station to give him a mother's care. All you can do is be thankful that the Army and the Red Cross take such good care of our boys. But you can help see to it that such precious supplies as blood plasma, food and ammunition, reach the front in prime condition — ready to do their job.

For every one of the 700,000 items shipped to our troops is protected against weather and dirt by paper and paperboard. That's why your government asks you to use less paper, and save every scrap you can. Remember that every time you are tempted to waste paper or destroy it.



Use Less Paper—Save All Wastepaper

This advertisement prepared by the War Advertising Council in cooperation with the W.P.B., the O.W.I. and published by this magazine, which has joined with the other magazines of the country to save more than 450,000,000 pounds of paper.

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

ors
the
ipt
les
the
of
uo-
not
P.,
ors
ess



Modern Language Notes

Volume LIX

NOVEMBER, 1944

Number 7

ANTIPODES

Il paraît que c'est la destinée des mots savants de recevoir un minimum d'attention de la part des lexicographes d'une génération de philologues pour qui la phonologie est tout et la sémantique rien ou fort peu de chose. Aussi n'est-on pas étonné de noter que l'article *Antipodes* est ou bien tout-à-fait absent ou bien réduit à quelques observations banales dans la plupart des dictionnaires français, à commencer par Littré jusqu'aux ouvrages récents de MM. Tobler, Gamillscheg et v. Wartburg.

Or il est avéré que le mot *Antipodes*, en dehors de son acception érudite bien connue, dérivée du grec, en a reçu, au cours du moyen âge, une deuxième, franchement nouvelle, c'est-à-dire inconnue dans les textes grecs et latins de l'antiquité. C'est celle qui nous occupera dans cette modeste contribution à la lexicographie de l'ancien français.

Dans l'*Erec* de Chrétien de Troyes, composé peu après 1160, on passe en revue les vassaux d'Arthur:

Bilis,¹ li rois d'Antipodes. . . .
De toz nains fu Bylis li mendres. . . .
Par richesce et par signorie
Amena an sa compaignie
Bylis dos rois qui nain estoient
Et de lui lor terre tenoient. . . .
A mervouilles l'esgardoit l'an.
Quant a la cort furent venu,
Formant i furent chier tenu.
A la cort furent come roi
Enoré et servi tuit troi;
Car mult estoient gentil home.²

¹ Variants: *bylis*, *belins*, *bilius*. On *Bilis-Pelles* cf. R.-S. Loomis, *PMLA*, LVI (1941), p. 921 et suiv.

² Je me sers du texte de M. Jean Misrahi, reproduit par M. R.-S. Loomis, *Modern Philology*, XXXVIII (1941), p. 292 et suiv.

On trouve une idée semblable dans le *Normannicus Draco*, poème latin d'Etienne de Rouen, composé vers 1168. Là le roi Arthur, après son décès et son transfert à Avalon, île sacrée, est censé vivre parmi les Antipodes.³ Si Chrétien laisse dans l'ombre la localité exacte de ces Antipodes, Etienne de Rouen est beaucoup plus explicite: il dit expressément qu'Arthur règne sur le *hemispherium inferius, inferior mundus: Evolat ad superos, grandoque recurrit ad ima*.⁴ L'antériorité du poème de Chrétien rend impossible l'hypothèse de M. Tatlock d'après laquelle l'auteur clérical du *Draco* aurait puisé indépendamment, sur sa propre responsabilité pour ainsi dire, dans certains auteurs classiques tels que Pomponius Mela, Pline l'Ancien, Solin, le *Somnium Scipionis* de Cicéron ou Martien Capella.⁵ Si influence classique et erudite il y a, il faut qu'elle se montre déjà dans Chrétien, dont l'auteur du *Draco* n'aurait fait que suivre l'exemple. En effet, Ferdinand Lot⁶ crut sérieusement à un emprunt, de la part de Chrétien, au livre des *Etymologies* (xiv, 6) d'Isidore de Séville.

Quoi qu'il en puisse être, la tradition ne prit pas fin avec Etienne de Rouen. Les *Gesta regum Britanniae*, composés vers 1235 et dédiés à Cadioc, évêque de Vannes, condamnent Modred, neveu d'Arthur pour avoir attaqué son oncle, "quem totus metuit mundus, quem totus abhorret Antipodum populus."⁷

Enfin, Gervais de Tilbury, qui composa ses *Otia Imperalia* dans le règne de Jean sans Terre (vers 1211), intitula un de ses contes *De antipodibus et eorum terra*. Le récit en question ne roule nullement, comme on pourrait le croire, sur un voyage en Terre Australie; mais il est tout bonnement un conte folklorique: ces Antipodes sont des nains, comme il a été en effet reconnu par le savant éditeur d'extraits choisis des *Otia*, Félix Liebrecht.⁸

Il serait facile de réduire toute cette tradition à une filiation purement littéraire qui aurait pris origine avec Chrétien, pour se transmettre d'écrivain à écrivain et aboutir à Gervais de Tilbury. Par malheur, une telle hypothèse, par trop simpliste, se heurte à

³ J. S. P. Tatlock, *MP*, xxxi (1933), p. 11.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁶ *Romania*, xlvi (1920), p. 42 et suiv.

⁷ Ed. F. Michel, Londres, 1862, p. 151; voir Loomis, *MP*, xxxviii, 292.

⁸ F. Liebrecht, *Des Gervasius von Tilbury Otia Imperalia in einer Auswahl neu herausgegeben . . .*, Hannover, 1856, p. 118.

deux difficultés: 1° Chrétien, certes, était beaucoup moins savant que n'importe lequel de ses successeurs écrivant en latin; 2° cette hypothèse présuppose une connaissance très générale de cette nouvelle acception du mot *Antipodes*, sans quoi ces textes seraient restés incompris. Or, quoi qu'on pense de la popularité des romans de Chrétien, elle n'était certes pas assez grande pour suffire à elle-même à établir cette nouvelle acception du mot dans la conscience de tous les lettrés contemporains. Il n'y a donc qu'une conclusion possible: Chrétien lui-même ne fit que suivre une tradition déjà bien établie qu'il contribua sans doute puissamment à affirmer, conclusion tirée il y a déjà quelques ans par M. Loomis.⁹ Il s'agit maintenant de savoir comment cette deuxième acception du mot "royaume souterrain des nains ou des fées" s'est d'abord développée.

Inutile d'ajouter ici que l'acception originale du mot *Antipodes* est un produit de la science ionienne qui, de la forme sphérique reconnue à la Terre, conclut que l'hémisphère austral, ou plutôt la partie située au sud de la zone torride (crue inhabitable), était peuplé d'êtres humains en tout semblables aux Méditerranéens. Par suite d'une application fausse de la préposition "sous" (comme cela arrive même de nos jours) on en vint à parler d'un hémisphère "inférieur." De là le passage énigmatique (mais qui est en réalité fort clair) de la lettre du pape Zacharie à St. Boniface à la date du 1^{er} mai 748:

Il y a sous la terre un autre monde, d'autres hommes, ainsi qu'un autre soleil et une autre lune.¹⁰

Par malheur, l'expression *terra inferior* "le monde souterrain" avait encore une autre acception, voire celui de "monde des morts,"

⁹ *MP*, XXXVIII, 293.

¹⁰ *Quod alias mundus et alii homines sub terra sint seu sol et luna;* *MGH, Epistolae*, III, 360, No. 80; voir H. van der Linden, *Virgile de Salzbourg et les théories cosmographiques au VIII^e siècle*, dans *Bull. de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences morales et politiques et de la Classe des Beaux-Arts*, 1914, p. 163-87, en l'espèce p. 180 et suiv.: Les termes "sous la terre" ici comme chez les auteurs immédiatement antérieurs ou postérieurs à Virgile, signifient sous notre œcumène. L'autre monde veut dire tout simplement l'autre œcumène; les autres hommes sont ceux qui habitent cette autre œcumène. L'autre soleil et l'autre lune veulent dire un autre ciel dans lequel le soleil et la lune occupent d'autres positions amenant ainsi notamment des saisons "opposées" aux nôtres.

désignant le royaume sinistre d'Hadès et Perséphone. C'est donc par une confusion que Macrobe (*Sat.* 1, 21, 3) nomme Proserpine "numen terrae inferioris circuli et antipodum."

Dériver la tradition citée ci-dessus d'un seul texte de Macrobe, si populaire qu'on veuille qu'il fût au moyen âge, c'est sans doute tout aussi hasardeux que de la dériver, à l'exemple de Ferdinand Lot, d'un texte des *Etymologies* d'Isidore de Séville. Si influence érudite il y avait,—et cela ne fait pas de doute,—il faut qu'elle repose sur une base considérablement plus large qu'un seul texte. D'autre part, le royaume de Perséphone, dans la pensée des anciens, n'était pas un pays de délices tel que les textes médiévaux le dépeignent et tel qu'il est seul digne du roi Arthur. Voyons donc ce que les anciens racontaient de plus sur la Terre Australe, le pays des Antipodes.

On savait que la Terre Australe était située quelque part au sud et à l'est de l'Inde, et l'on l'identifiait le plus souvent avec l'île de Ceylan, connue alors sous le nom de Taprobane et qu'on croyait beaucoup plus grande qu'elle ne l'est.¹¹ D'aucuns y voyaient plus qu'une grande île et la tenaient pour un véritable continent. Pomponius Mela (*De cosmogr.*, III, 7) la considère comme une très grande île *aut prima pars Orbis alterius*. Pline l'Ancien (VI, 22), suivi de Solin (c. 53), s'exprime comme suit:

Taprobanem alterum orbem terrarum esse, diu existimatum est, Antichthonum appellatione . . . extra orbem a natura relegata . . .

où il faut noter qu'*Antichthonum* est synonyme d'*Antipodum*.

Or il est certes curieux que Luain, en résumant la doctrine des Druides, ne s'exprime pas autrement:

Vobis auctoribus, umbrae
Non tacitas Erebi sedes Ditisque profundi
Pallida regna petunt; regit idem spiritus artus
Orbe alio; longae, canitis si cognita, vitae
Mors media est,¹²

où *orbis alius* veut dire, ainsi qu'il a été démontré par Salomon Reinach,¹³ "région, contrée," peut-être "continent."

Il est donc clair que, suivant les Druides, les âmes des défunts s'en allaient vivre dans une autre région ou dans un autre con-

¹¹ Pline, *Histoire naturelle*, VI, 22; Solin, *Collect.*, c. 53; Isidore, *Etym.*, XIV, 6.

¹² Phars., V, 449-53.

¹³ *Cultes, Mythes et Religions*, I (1922), p. 184 et suiv.

tinent de la terre séparé par l'océan du monde des vivants. Rien n'indique, il est vrai, que cet *orbis alias* des Druides fût la Terre Australe, le pays des Antipodes. Il y a pourtant des indices que, quelle qu'en ait été l'opinion des anciens Celtes, les Gallois médiévaux, évidemment sous l'influence des traditions savantes transmises par l'antiquité, identifiaient cet *orbis alias* avec Taprobane, le continent austral. Ecouteons ce qu'en disent les triades galloises :¹⁴

Trois piliers de nation de l'île de Prydein: le premier est Hu Gadarn (le fort), qui vint le premier, avec la nation des Cymry, dans l'île de Prydein; ils venaient du pays de l'été, qu'on appelle Deffrobani (c'est-à-dire Taprobane), là où est Constantinople; ils traversèrent la mer Tawch et parvinrent dans l'île de Prydein et en Llydaw, où ils s'arrêtèrent . . .

Le Hu Gadarn dont il est question dans ce texte est l'ancêtre mythique des Gallois, inventeur de l'agriculture et démiurge. Nous en avons parlé ailleurs.¹⁵ A rapprocher de ce texte la tradition bien connue transmise par César (*BG.*, vi, 18) et d'après laquelle les Gaulois se disaient descendus de Dispater, divinité nettement chthonienne, on est amené à conclure que le pays mystérieux de Deffrobani-Taprobane est l'équivalent de l'Hadès gréco-romain. Pour l'exprimer autrement, dans la pensée des Gallois médiévaux, la Terre Australe, le pays des Antipodes, était le pays d'outre-tombe d'où les ancêtres des Cymri atteignirent la Grande-Bretagne.

Ce qui confirme cette conclusion, c'est que ce pays d'outre-tombe, loin de ressembler à l'Hadès classique, est décrit, dans ces documents, comme un pays d'abondance, où règne un été éternel (*Gwlad yr Haf* "pays de l'été"), ce qui explique que les céréales étaient censées y avoir pris origine. D'autre part, c'est précisément avec des couleurs tout aussi riantes que les anciens dépeignaient l'île de Taprobane ou le continent austral, supposé abondant en perles et pierreries, jouissant d'un climat admirable et dont les habitants atteignaient un âge bien plus grand que les hommes de notre monde.¹⁶ De fait, la *Vita Merlini*, dans sa description des merveilles de plusieurs îles de l'océan, n'oublie pas Taprobane. D'où il

¹⁴ J. Loth, *Les Mabinogion*, Paris, 1913, II, 295.

¹⁵ *ZFSL*, LIX (1935), 361 et suiv.

¹⁶ Pline, *Histoire naturelle*, VI, 22; VII, 2; cp. Martien Capella, ed. Dick, *De nuptiis*, VI, p. 346. Cp. aussi la description de l'*orbis alias* donnée par Elien, *var. hist.*, III, 18, sur l'autorité de Théopompe.

s'ensuit que, sous l'influence d'une tradition savante de l'antiquité, les médiévaux croyaient voir dans la Terre Australe, pays des Antipodes, *l'orbis alias*, le pays d'outre-tombe des anciens Celtes.¹⁷ Cette identification est complètement indépendante des dires de Macrobius et repose sur certaines croyances eschatologiques assez répandues vers la fin de l'empire romain et d'après lesquelles les Iles des Bienheureux, séjour des morts vertueux, étaient localisées dans la Terre Australe.¹⁸ On sait que cette tradition est la source de Dante quand il plaça la montagne du Purgatoire dans cette région de la Terre.

Il nous reste un problème à résoudre. Dans Chrétien de Troyes, dans le conte précité des *Otia Imperalia*, mais aussi dans un récit du traité *De Nugis Curialium* de Gautier Map cité par M. Loomis,¹⁹ les habitants de ce pays mystérieux sont des nains. Dans la pensée de ces auteurs les Antipodes sont donc des nains. Comment expliquer cette particularité?

Là aussi il faut supposer deux sources indépendantes, une savante et une populaire. Les anciens Grecs connaissaient une tradition d'après laquelle l'intérieur de l'Afrique est habité par des pygmées, peuplade de nains.²⁰ Ce qui est moins connu, c'est que les géographes grecs et romains savaient fort bien qu'il y a des nains dans l'Asie du Sud, qu'ils pensaient aux Veddahs de Ceylan, aux habitants des îles Andaman, aux *negritos* de Bornéo, de la Nouvelle-Guinée ou de Mindanao.²¹

D'un autre côté, pour des raisons discutées en détail il y a pres-

¹⁷ Rien n'est plus faux que l'assertion de M. Loomis, *PMLA*, lvi, 896, que les notions eschatologiques changent rapidement et s'oublient vite: la conception d'un enfer souterrain, séjour sans joie, n'a pas changé depuis l'époque lointaine qui vit la composition de l'épopée de Gilgamech jusqu'au temps des inscriptions funéraires de la fin de l'Empire romain. Les exemples anglo-saxons cités par M. Loomis (p. 896, n. 68) prouvent en effet que les Anglo-Saxons avant leur conversion au christianisme avaient déjà *perdu* leurs croyances eschatologiques; mais ils ne prouvent pas qu'ils les eussent *oubliées*. On peut ne pas croire à l'Enfer chrétien sans pour cela en ignorer le concept.

¹⁸ F. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, New Haven, 1922, p. 80.

¹⁹ *PMLA*, lvi, 917.

²⁰ Voir Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopaedie*, s. v. *Pygmæi*.

²¹ A. De Quatrefages, *The Pygmies*, trans. F. Starr, New-York, 1895, p. 20 et suiv.; E. Tyson, *A Philological Essay concerning the Pygmies of the Ancients* (1699), re-edited by B. C. A. Windle, Londres, 1894, p. xvi et suiv.

que quinze ans,²² les nains celtiques et germaniques sont sans exceptions des êtres chthoniens, les ancêtres divinisés (*manes*). Dans les mots d'un savant qui, pour n'être pas philologue, en était sans doute d'autant plus impartial et objectif, le regretté Fridtjof Nansen,²³ les *huldræ* norvégiens, les *sið* irlandais et les elfes germaniques étaient à l'origine les morts.²⁴ Il aurait pu ajouter qu'il en est de même chez les Amazulus, en sorte qu'il s'agit, suivant toutes les apparences, d'une croyance aussi vieille que le monde ou plutôt aussi vieille que l'humanité. Les Celtes n'en faisaient pas exception.

Résumons. Le mot *Antipodes*, en dehors de son acceptation savante dûment notée par les dictionnaires, au moyen âge en avait reçu une autre: il désignait les ancêtres divinisés censés habiter, sous forme de nains, non pas la Terre Australe, mais les enfers (*infera*), pays d'outre-tombe localisé sous terre, le plus souvent à l'intérieur des collines des fées (*siðe*). Ce développement curieux est dû d'une part à une fausse application de la préposition "sous," de l'autre au fait que le royaume des morts, dans la pensée des anciens Celtes, était situé soit dans un autre continent (*orbis alias*), identifié avec la Terre Australe des anciens géographes, soit sous terre, à l'intérieur des collines des fées.

ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE

Princeton, N. J.

²² Dans mon livre, *The Science of Folk-Lore*, Londres, 1930, p. 87 et suiv.

²³ *In Northern Mists*, New-York, 1911, II, 60.

²⁴ Chose curieuse, M. Loomis lui-même, et sans s'en apercevoir, cite deux exemples qui ne laissent pas subsister le moindre doute sur la vraie nature de l'"autre monde" celtique. A la p. 917, en résumant le conte de Gautier Map, il fait observer que les nains disparaissent au chant du coq. Mais, comme l'a fait remarquer sir James G. Frazer, dans une de ses pages les plus émouvantes (*Anthropological Essays presented to Edward Burnett Tylor . . .*, Oxford, 1907, p. 137), c'est là le propre des revenants. A la p. 925 et suiv. M. Loomis parle de la sentinelle silentieuse mentionnée par Nennius et des habitants "silentieux" de l'île mystérieuse qui est l'"autre monde" celtique, relevés dans le *Perlesvaus*, dans l'*Imram Brain* et dans l'*Historia Meriadoci*. Mais il ne se rappelle pas que les "silentieux" (*taciti*) sont les morts et que c'est là probablement leur épithète la plus caractéristique. Voir là-dessus *Classical Philology*, XXXVI (1941), p. 137; Konrad Schwenck, *Die Sinnbilder der alten Völker*, Frankfurt a. M., 1851, p. 153 et suiv.; Camille Sourdille, *Hérodote et la religion de l'Egypte*, Paris, 1910, p. 362; A. Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*, Leipzig, 1930, p. 668.

AN ANONYMOUS SIXTEENTH CENTURY FRENCH
PLAY ON THE DEATH OF LUCRETIA

The overthrow of the Tarquins' dictatorship and the establishment of the republic are represented by Livy, Ovid and other ancient writers¹ as results of the rape by the younger Tarquin, Sextus, of Lucretia, the wife of his cousin and fellow-officer, Collatinus. After being forced, Lucretia made her husband and family swear to avenge her, and then stabbed herself. The effort to do honor to these oaths of vengeance brought about the downfall of the Tarquins.

In spite of its difficulty, this story has tempted many dramatists and other writers in various countries. Hans Galinsky, who has treated the subject extensively in *Der Lucretia-Stoff in der Weltliteratur*,² lists most of these versions, among them four (possibly seven) French plays.³

The earliest in date of the French plays, N. Filleul's *Lucrèce*, 1566, he mentions quite rightly only in passing,⁴ for though well known and available in a reprint,⁵ it is a sad performance. Another much superior sixteenth century play, *Tragédie sur la mort de Lucresse*, has entirely escaped Galinsky's notice and indeed that of almost everyone else. This oversight or deliberate omission is possibly due to the fact that the tragedy was left in manuscript by the unknown author. The undated manuscript,⁶ bound in beautiful red leather, is written in a hand extremely difficult to decipher, similar or identical, it appears to me, to that of the manuscript of the *Tragédie de Rhodes*⁷ composed in 1608 by Louis Léger. I do

¹ Livy, I, 55-59; Ovid, *Fasti*, II, lines 721-852. According to La Croix du Maine, Fr. le Duchat published a verse translation of Ovid's version with his *Agamemnon*, Paris, Jean le Preux, 1561. For other possible sources see Dio Cassius, II; Dion. Hal., III, 47-63; IV, 64; Valerius Max., VI, I, 1; L. Florus, I, 8; Zonaras, VIII, 11.

² In *Sprache und Kultur der Germanischen-Romanischen Völker*. B. Germanistische Reihe. Band III. Breslau, 1932.

³ Filleul, 1566; Chevreau, 1637; P. du Ryer, 1638; F. Ponsard, 1843. He refers also to possible plays by Louis Napoleon and Arnault (p. 180) and a plan for a "tragédie en prose" by Rousseau (p. 174).

⁴ P. 80.

⁵ By Eugène de Robillard de Beaurepaire, Rouen, Henri Boissel, 1873.

⁶ No. 25508 at B. N.

⁷ No. 2383 at B. N.

not wish to imply that Léger was the author of the tragedy in question, for there is no close similarity in style, but that the copies were penned by the same or contemporary copyists. Because of this and general stylistic indications, I should say that this tragedy belongs to the reign of Henry IV. Aside from the fact that there is no chorus and that the language is more sober, the manner of composition resembles that of Garnier, Billard, Chrestien des Croix, and others of the time.

The plot, which follows the general indications of the sources with only minor changes, is organized as follows:

i, 1. Sexte tells of his meeting with Lucresse and the torments of his love. 2. Tarquin le Superbe boasts in the customary style of kings in sixteenth century French tragedy.

ii, 1. Sexte solves his moral problem by resolving to commit suicide. 2. His *confidant*, Publye, suggests the rape and Sexte accepts the solution.

iii, 1. Lucresse relates a dream, which warns of the coming tragedy, and discusses it with her nurse. 2. Sexte and Publye set out for Collatine to put their dastardly plan into action. 3. Lucresse welcomes them to her home. Sexte's reason for his visit, "*Quand nous serons seuls, ie vous conteray tout*," is a nice example of *double entendre*.

iv, 1. Collatin and Brute are starting for Collatine in answer to an urgent summons from Lucresse. 2. In a frenzy of rage and grief, Lucresse relates Tarquin's crime to her nurse. 3. Tarquin rejoices in his victory but fears retribution.

v, 1. Lucresse tells her father, Collatin, and Brute the details of Tarquin's attack. Since the relation is rather lively and vivid, a considerable portion of it is quoted here as a sample of the text. Lucresse had fallen asleep after showing her guest to his room,

Et alors qu'vn chacun aultre chose ne pense
 Qu'à reposer son corps assoupy en silence
 Luy qui est agité d'infernelle fureur
 (Quand ie pense à cela ie frissonne d'horreur)
 Ayant le glaive au poing entré ⁸ dedans ma chambre
 Et en vn mesme temps sur mon liet il se cambre
 Et puis en m'esueillant ce bourreau inhumain
 Me presse l'estomac de sa damnable main.
 Ie m'esueille en sursaut de frayeur toute esmeüe.
 Lors ce meschant me dict, Lucresse ie te tüe
 Si tu dis vn seul mot et ce poignard d'acier
 Te fera repentir si tu penses crier.
 Chetifue que ie suis sentant contre ma gorge
 La pointe du poignard qui ia presque m'esgorge

⁸ The MS. gives entre.

Si proche me voyant de la fin de mes iours
 Et de moy esloigné tout espoir de secours
 Ie n'eusse ozé crier. Lors d'vne voix flatteuse
 Il commence à conter sa douleur amoureuse.
 Il me prie instamment et pour l'obtenir mieux
 Me coniure à l'aymer par tous les puissants dieux
 De vouloir soulager et appaiser la flamme
 Qui pour l'amour de moy tout le cœur luy enflamme,
 Que si i'eusse voulu ses prières ouyr
 Et luy permettre aussi de ses Amours⁹ iouir
 Il me debuoyt donner mille belles richesses;
 Mais ayant aperceu que toutes ses promesses
 Ses parolles, ses vœux, ses coniurations
 Ne pouuoyent m'esmouuoir et que ses pations
 Ie n'auoys point à gré, lors plus enflé d'audace
 De me faire mourir furieux me menace,
 Et voyant à la fin que malgré ses efforts
 I'arrestoys d'endurer plustost dix mille morts,
 Puis que dit-il alors vous estes si cruelle,
 Puis qu'à ma volonté vous estes si rebelle,
 Vous mourrez de ma main et de ce mien estoc
 I'ouuriray vostre cœur plus dur que n'est vn roe
 Et affin que la mort vous donne plus de peine
 Pour auoir enuers moy esté si inhumaine
 Mon valet icy pres aussi i'esgorgeray
 Et dans vn mesme lict tous deux vous coucheray.
 Ie publiray partout, par les dieux ie le iure,
 Que pour vous chastier et pour vanger l'iniure
 Qu'ensemble vous faisiez à vostre Collatin
 I'auray d'vn mesme coup à vos iours mis la fin.
 Ie vouloys bien mourir mais la crainte de honte
 Qui onc ne me quitta mon courage surmonte.
 Et lors Sexte du corps non de l'ame vainqueur
 La despouille emporta de mon pudique honneur.

She then stabs herself, and Brute, withdrawing the knife, swears to avenge the crime. The others swear to do likewise.

2. Tarquin le Superbe and his son Arons are told by a messenger that Brute has aroused the populace to rebellion by a speech over Lucresse's dead body. Tarquin reproaches the absent Sexte and breaks into lamentations, accusing the Romans of ingratitude.

It seems fairly certain that the author consulted both Livy and Ovid. For example Sexte's reference in the first act to Lucresse's

⁹ This word is almost illegible in the MS. *Amours* is probably the correct reading.

blonds cheveux must have been suggested by Ovid,¹⁰ since the color of her hair is not mentioned in the other sources; but at least one detail in Lucresse's confession:

Pour le moins cy-apres mon exemple publique
Aulcune n'appendra à viure en impudieque,

occurs only in Livy.¹¹

The author imitated also certain patterns of style, originally from classical models but present in nearly all sixteenth century tragedies: laments with apostrophes to the sky, sea, gods, or other things; dreams and discussions of their value; long comparisons; the *impossible* motif; arguments concerning suicide; boasts by kings and leaders of power and prowess.

In addition to these common traits, the author has used a procedure similar to that of Jean de la Taille's grafting of *Hercules Furens* on the biblical story of Saul. Instead of *Hercules* he has apparently used Garnier's *Hippolyte* and has even pointed out the analogy himself. In Act iv, Lucresse, feeling that her involuntary loss of chastity will be judged a crime, refers to similar cases of innocence unjustly punished. Among others, she compares herself to Hippolyte:

Ainsy dedans l'enfer Phœdre te précipite
Pour se voir refusée o trop chaste Hypollite.

As a first result of this imitation, Sexte is a strange mixture of the characters of Phedre and Hippolyte. Like the latter, he had been fond of hunting and related pleasures:

Et contre ma coustume et mon humeur chagrine
Ie ne desire plus ainsy que ie souloys
Courir vn sanglier pour le rendre aux aboys.
La chasse me deplaist et la course et la luict,
Lancer le iauelot ou ma dextre est bien ducite
Me sont à contre-cœur . . .¹²

At the same time Sexte, like Phedre, considers his love incestuous, a disease:

¹⁰ *Fasti*, II, 763: *Forma placet niveusque color flavique capilli. . .*

¹¹ I, 58: . . . nec ulla deinde impudice Lucretia exemplo vivet.

¹² I, 1. Garnier, *Hippolyte*, III, 2, describes (from Seneca) Hippolyte's shyness and fondness for hunting. The analogy with Racine's *Phèdre*, II, 2, lines 548-552, is even closer, though there can be no question of influence.

Le mal me presse fort et qui plus me deplait
 C'est qu'estant au mourir encor mon mal me plait . . .
 C'est vn mortel poison qui lentement rebouche
 La vigueur de l'esprit aussitost qu'il le touche . . .
 Plus ie veux cest amour chasser par la raison
 Plus ie me sens serré dans sa forte prison . . .
 O vous tous aultres dieux . . .
 Desracinez le mal qui mon ame tourmente . . .¹³

Like Phèdre also, he resolves to end his torments by suicide, and argues the matter with Publye (in the rôle of the nurse), who suggests the crime.

Lucresse too has some of the elements of the same two characters. Like Hippolyte, she suffers the consequences of a crime of which she is innocent, while the protests of her nurse against her resolve to die have many analogies with those of Phèdre's:

Lucresse's nurse:

Ce n'est pas vn pesché quand par la violence
 On force nostre corps à faire quelque offence.

Phèdre's nurse:

On peut forcer le corps, mais l'âme qui est pure,
 Maugré le ravisieur est exempte d'injure.¹⁴

A dream in which Lucresse was the object of an attack by a *bouc* that had at first fawned upon and then trampled her may have been suggested by Hippolyte's vision of an attack by a lion.¹⁵

There is also the further analogy of the unsatisfactory auspices and disturbed sacrifices following both dreams.

By her fierce pride and inflexible will, Lucresse is also a worthy forerunner of Corneille's heroines. When her nurse tried to convince her of her entire innocence, she haughtily replied:

Ces raisons pourroyent bien vn cœur lasche fleschir,
 Mais le mien de l'honneur ne sceut iamais gauchir.

This tragedy has evident faults, most of them common to the

The fact that *sanglier* is treated as a word of three syllables makes it probable that the play is not earlier than the reign of Henri IV.

¹³ The general tone and idea are those of Phèdre's confession to her nurse, *Hippolyte*, II, 1, though there is little verbal similarity.

¹⁴ *Hippolyte*, V, last two lines before *choeur*.

¹⁵ *Hippolyte*, I, 2.

others of the period: it is verbose and awkward, all in long monologues, and the verse is often lame and the rimes weak, the idea of tragedy that of the sixteenth century, but the author does bring in the crude beginning of psychological analysis. The characters try to explain and justify their conduct.

More interesting still, we find the rudiments of a dramatic struggle. As Sexte (Act 1) discusses his love, he finally realizes that what he contemplates is not exactly honorable:

Mais quoy, voudray-ie bien de mon cher Collatin
Raurir la chaste espouse? O malheur! O destin!
O fortune! O incombre! O ciel! O Amphitrite!
O fleuves infernaux, Flegeton et Cocyté!
Recepuez-moy plustost. Je ne le feray pas . . .
Plustost, Grand Iupiter, iette en bas ta tempeste,
Que ton foudre grondant vienne escraser ma teste
Que ie face cela . . .

After several pages of this, he leaves for battle, hoping to forget his illicit love.

In the second act, he is beginning to lose the struggle, and his sufferings, like those of Phèdre, approach madness:

Mais Sexte, où est ton cœur que l'amour monstrueux
En ton ame naissant t'a rendu furieux?

Meurs donc asseurement auant que ceste rage
Contre ta parenté¹⁶ commette cest outrage.

Although this resolve to sacrifice his life to his honor appears sincere, the author represents him as too easily persuaded by Publye to undertake the crime:¹⁷

L'autis n'est pas mauuais, c'est le chemin plus court
Pour estre iouissant du fruct de mon amour.

In spite of this ready surrender, Sexte's character has, nevertheless, been so rehabilitated that he can almost conform to the ideal of the tragic protagonist, essentially good but having faults and weaknesses that lead to his downfall. The cold-blooded criminal of the legend and Filleul's *Lucrèce* has become an over-indulged,

¹⁶ The accent does not show in the text, but *parenté* would produce an example of *coupe féminine*.

¹⁷ None of the sources indicate that anyone suggested the crime to Sexte. This seems another example of the *Hippolyte* pattern imposed upon the story.

weak young man still possessing the vestiges of a sense of decency and honor but ready to snatch at any means of obtaining what he wants.

The language is less dated than Garnier's or even Montchrétien's; it has none of the diminutives, compounds and coinages of the Pléiade, and is much simpler and in better taste than that of such contemporaries as Billard, Nicolas de Montreux, or Chrétien des Croix.

It seems to me, moreover, that this tragedy, crude as it may appear to modern taste, represents an advance over those of Jodelle, Filleul, and Garnier, but that the progress should be so small for so great a lapse of time demonstrates the slowness with which tragedy was inching forward to prepare the way for the seventeenth century.

LANCASTER E. DABNEY

The University of Texas

COMME QUOI

Les grammaires de Plattner (II, 2; IV, 73), de Sandfeld (II, 71) et de Le Bidois (II, 634) nous renseignent sur l'emploi moderne de cette conjonction qui est caractéristique du style familier. Il y a en somme deux emplois, l'un dans l'incidente dépendant de verbes comme *raconter*, *expliquer*, *dire* (ou leurs équivalents, p. ex. *faire l'observation*), plus rarement *voir* (*découvrir*) et *voilà*, et où la conjonction a à peu près la valeur de *que*,—et l'autre dans la principale, que Plattner est seul à enregistrer: "Comme quoi tout s'efface avec le temps, comme quoi tout s'effrite" et que je trouve p. ex. dans le numéro du 18 août 1934 de "Pour la victoire": la moralité d'une histoire sur les gendarmes français qui, alors déjà, commençaient à avoir peur du jour des comptes qui suivrait de près la victoire interalliée, est formulée ainsi: *Comme quoi, la "peur du gendarme" est le commencement de la sagesse*" (à remarquer la virgule après *comme quoi*).

L'explication de cette conjonction ne me semble pas encore fermement établie: Sandfeld voit en *comme quoi* "une vieille combinaison de *comme* (= comment) avec la forme 'forte' de la conjonction *que*" et compare la forme vulgaire de la conjonction *com-*

ment que (ils se douteront comment que je les ai eues). C'est en somme l'explication de Tobler, *Verm. Beitr.* I, 165, qui offre comme parallèles a. fr. *de quoi, par coi, por coi* à côté de *dont, par que, por que*. Mais *comment que* (et *quand que, pourquoi que* etc.) s'expliquent évidemment par le schéma que le français moderne tend à généraliser d'après *parce que, lorsque, quoique, combien que* etc.: adverbe + *que*, et ne peut rien prouver pour un *comme quoi* = *comme que*. D'autre part, un *de quoi* (encore chez Corneille, *Galerie du Palais: je ne m'étonne plus de quoi je gagne tant*) me semble mieux s'expliquer par le pronom *relatif* tonique: "je ne m'étonne plus de *la raison pourquoi* (= *de quoi*) je gagne tant," cf. aussi Lerch, *Hist. Synt.* II, 108 (qui voit dans *de quoi* un successeur moyen fr. de l'anc. fr. *dont* d'origine parallèle: *dont* = *de unde* avec *unde* pronom interrogatif: *je m'étonne dont, de quoi . . .* = "je m'étonne (et voudrais savoir) de quoi [vient que]," cf. angl. *I wonder how . . .* "je m'étonne [et j'aimerais bien savoir] comment").

Tobler pense que l'explication de Littré, s. v. *comme* n° 4 "wird schwerlich jemand befriedigen." Voici ce que dit l'illustre lexicographe: "*Comme quoi*, de quelle façon. Voilà comme quoi il est fort dangereux d'avoir demi-étudié. Balz. . . . Vous savez comme quoi je vous suis tout acquise, Corn., Rod. . . . *Comme quoi* est aussi interrogatif, mais très peu usité en cet emploi. *Comme quoi* n'êtes-vous pas persuadé? // *Comme quoi* est de difficile explication. *Comme* a parfois le sens de *comment*; et l'on dit, interrogativement, ayant mal entendu: comme quoi? Cette étoffe est comme du satin; si on a mal entendu, on dira dans le langage très familier: Comme quoi? *Comme quoi* est devenu de la sorte une locution faite, qui s'est introduite pour ne signifier rien de plus que *comment*." Donc, Littré pense à un *comme quoi?* (faisant écho à des phrases du type . . . *comme du satin*) = 'comment?', ayant débordé les limites originaires. On trouve un *comme quoi?* aussi dans l'acceptation 'comme [par exemple] quoi?', 'dans quel genre?', p. ex. (probablement) dans un passage tiré de O. Feuillet, cité par Plattner sans référence plus précise: "Je vous demanderai un jour une foule de chose qui m'inquiètent, que je ne sais pas et que je voudrais savoir!—*Comme quoi?* [= des choses de quel genre?]—*Comme quoi?* c'est-ce que vous ne saurez pas de si tôt."¹

¹ Je crois ce *comme quoi?* = 'comme [par exemple] quoi?' identique à

Haase, *Franz. Syntax des 17. Jhs.* (1888), p. 63 est seul à avoir vu qu'on doit partir d'une interrogation directe parallèle à *comme cela* (*comme ça*):² *ce livre est comme ça* = 'ainsi' — *comme quoi est le livre?* = 'comment ?'; p. ex. Guez de Balzac: "Comme quoi jouir tranquillement du présent, qui n'est pas bon?" (= 'comment jouir . . . ?'), de là dans l'interrogation indirecte (*id.*): "je ne vois pas *comme quoi* [= 'comment'] on peut faire obéir les autres," La Fontaine: "et voici *comme quoi*" (= 'comment'). *Comme quoi?* et *comme ç(el)a* doivent être tous deux des expressions populaires substituant à la précision du terme synthétique ('comment?' = 'ainsi') l'à-peu-près d'une comparaison plutôt vague et un tour analytique qui est en harmonie avec le développement général du français moderne (cf. le 'décumul' dans *ensuite > après ça*, H. Frei, *La grammaire des fautes*, p. 203) et, d'ailleurs, aussi en anglais (*like this* au lieu de *thus*, *what . . . like?* au lieu de *how?*). Sur la priorité de *comme quoi?* dans l'interrogation directe nous trouvons une information précieuse dans une des *Remarques sur la langue françoise* de Vaugelas (1647), p. 333 de l'éd. de la Société des textes français modernes: "*comme quoy* est un terme nouveau, qui n'a cours que depuis peu d'années, mais qui est tellement usité, qu'on l'a à tous propos dans la bouche. Apres cela, on ne peut pas blasmer ceux qui l'escrivent, mesme à l'exemple d'un des plus excellens & des plus celebres Escrivains de France, qui s'en sert d'ordinaire pour *comment*, *comme quoy*, dit-il, *n'estes-vous point persuadé*, pour dire, *comment n'estes-vous persuadé*. Mais pour moy, j'aimerois mieux dire, *comment*, selon cette reigle generale, *qu'un mot ancien, qui est encore dans la vigueur de l'Usage, est incomparablement meilleur à escrire, qu'un tout nouveau, qui signifie la mesme chose*. . . .

l'emploi signalé par Godefroy dans son *lexique de la langue de Corneille*: 'Il a vu . . . ' — 'Qui?' — 'Daphnis, et n'en a remporté / Que ce qu'elle devoit à sa témérité.' — 'Comme quoi?' — 'Des mépris, des rigueurs sans pareilles' (*La Suivante*).

² Il est vrai que l'historique de *comme cela* n'est pas encore établi. Existait-il déjà au XVII^e siècle? Dans le conte de *Cendrillon* de Perrault (1677) la fille aînée dit: *un vilain Cucendron comme cela*, mais *comme cela* a le sens littéral comparatif, avec un *cela* neutre appliqué 'au' Cucendron (Cendrillon) désexualisé; il ne s'y agit nullement d'un emploi grammaticalisé (= 'ainsi'). Toujours est-il que la nuance familière et vague est encore très forte (*il parla ainsi—il disait comme ça . . .*).

Ce n'est pas que je ne me voulusse servir de *comme quoy*, qui a souvent bonne grace, mais ce ne seroit gueres que dans un stile familier." Cette remarque, négligée par Tobler et Sandfeld, nous indique que *comme quoi?* interrogatif était du temps de Vaugelas un néologisme récent, au moins dans la langue de Paris. Il sera donc de bonne méthode de partir de l'emploi le plus anciennement attesté et d'expliquer celui-ci, non pas par de l'ancien français, mais par du français contemporain du grammairien.³ Il est évident que l'interrogatif direct *comme quoi n'êtes-vous point persuadé?*, correspondant à un all. *wie so sind Sie nicht überzeugt?* — "wie [ist es] so dass Sie nicht überzeugt sind?", à un all. ancien *wie dass* — "wie [kommt es] dass" et à un anglais *how (does it) come (that) you are not convinced?* doit s'expliquer par un tour elliptique: "*comme quoi* (= à quoi dois-je comparer le fait que) vous n'êtes point persuadé?", "*comment est-il possible que . . .?*" — la 'grâce' et le ton familier viennent de la nuance d'embarras et d'étonnement qui se traduit d'une façon spontanée par la question: *Comment . . .?* est l'expression de gens sensés qui savent dominer leur étonnement, *comme quoi . . .?* nous permet de réaliser les sentiments de l'individu parlant, impuissant de s'orienter (tant la chose rapportée est inouïe), mais tâchant de trouver un cas parallèle comparable. Littré était au moins bien inspiré en partant de la question directe, bien que l'exemple particulier choisi par lui . . . *comme du satin* — *Comme quoi?* ne puisse pas nous servir de modèle; il a vu plus juste que Tobler, qui construisait un *quoi* forme tonique de la conjonction *que*, pratiquement inexistant, et Haase a vu plus juste que les deux grammairiens ensemble.

Le *comme quoi?* de l'interrogation directe, devenu égal à un *comment?* familier, mais retenant son ton d'étonnement, passe ensuite à l'interrogation indirecte: la phrase de Corneille: *vous savez comme quoi je vous suis tout acquise (Rodogune)* veut donc dire "vous savez comme [c'est sans parallèle que] je vous suis tout acquise," c'est à dire que *comme quoi* insiste sur les circonstances de détail inouïes, sans parallèle, dans lesquelles le fait "je vous suis tout acquise" se vérifie. Dans un autre passage de Corneille:

³ Le dictionnaire de la langue du XVI^e siècle d'Huguet n'a aucun exemple de *comme quoi*, ce qui confirme les dires de Vaugelas. Au contraire, Marguerite Buffet répète encore en 1688 que *comme quoi* est une expression nouvelle.

“Jugez après cela *comme quoi* je vous aime” (*Illusion comique*)⁴ on pourrait admettre l'équivalence de l'incidente à “[jugez de] l'amour sans parallèle [*comme quoi?*] que je sens pour vous.” On notera que les verbes *savoir*, *juger*, *voir* (dans *voilà*) indiquent la possibilité qu'a l'interlocuteur de vérifier *comment* (“wie, wie in aller Welt”) la chose étonnante dont on parle a pu arriver. Cet emploi subsiste encore dans des phrases comme:⁵ “Elle découvrait dans l'espace *comme quoi* c'était impossible qu'on m'ammenât” (Boylesve), “Dieu voulut qu'il y vît *comme quoi* le sultan Envoiait tous les jours une sultane en terre” (Musset), où *comme quoi* n'est sûrement pas, comme dit la grammaire de Le Bidois, “un simple outil de subordination.” “L'emploi de *comme quoi* au sens de *comment* marquant la manière semble assez rare,” dit Sandfeld: il n'a qu'un exemple “contemporain,” tiré de Zola: “Madame Alexandre prit place au comptoir, servit la clientèle . . . car madame Edouard n'avait jamais eu d'autre souci que d'être avec la majorité de ses acheteurs. *Voilà comme quoi* la présence de madame Alexandre, au comptoir . . . , devint pour tous un signe certain que l'école des Frères devait bien être malade.” Pourtant cet emploi est celui qui, dans l'incidente, se rapproche le plus du sens originaire (“voilà *comment* il a pu se faire que . . . ,” avec la nuance de l'étonnement). L'emploi courant aujourd'hui, après les *verba dicendi* (“Elle racontait ses petites affaires, *comme quoi*, par exemple, elle allait hériter de 17 ou 18 millions”; “Alors, pour m'excuser, je tâchais de lui *expliquer comme quoi* ce n'était pas notre faute aussi”), contient un *comme quoi* = *comment*, légèrement ironique, qui distancie l'individu parlant des paroles qu'il rapporte (dans le dernier exemple de ses propres paroles, qui lui sont devenues étrangères): c'est comme si la nuance primordiale d'étonnement, d'embarras s'était émoussée et comme s'il ne restait que ce sentiment de la distance, ce dédoublement de l'individu parlant en rapporteur et en critique de paroles qu'il n'est pas tenu d'approuver: *Elle racontait ses petites affaires, comme quoi . . .*

⁴ M. Lancaster me signale le fait que Corneille n'a introduit *comme quoi* que dans l'édition de 1660: de 1639 à 1657 le texte portrait le *si* discret. C'est dire que l'expression avait en 1660 encore toute sa fraîcheur.

⁵ J'omets la virgule que j'ai trouvée dans le texte: peut-être y a-t-il là une interprétation secondaire de *comme quoi* = ‘de tout ceci résulte,’ ‘à la suite de quoi on peut dire’ (avec *quoi* interprété comme relatif), qu'il ne faut pas prendre trop au sérieux du point de vue historique.

elle allait hériter — “elle racontait qu’elle allait hériter, mais c’étaient ses (étonnantes) petites affaires à elles, qui ne me regardent pas, dont je n’ai pas à m’occuper.” Le nivelingement de *comme quoi* ‘comment’ > ‘que’ a un parallèle en *comment* au lieu de *que* complétif (“Je ne comprends pas *comment* tu épouses une femme qui a deux éfants” “il me raconte *comment* on avait mis le feu, dans la nuit, à la maison . . . ,” Sandfeld, p. 71): à l’origine *comment* donnait une image de *la manière* dont s’accomplit un événement, puis le *fait*, qui est arrivé, dominera dans l’esprit de l’individu parlant. Je vois la même distance un peu railleuse dans le *comme quoi* de la phrase principale, qui doit être une extraction secondaire de l’emploi en incidente: “Comme quoi⁶ la ‘peur du gendarme’ est le commencement de la sagesse”—le ton interrogatif manque, donc il faut comprendre une dérivation du *comme quoi* = *que* et suppléer un sujet de type général: “[on dirait] comme quoi . . . ,” “comme dirait l’autre. . . .” Le sage qui formule la maxime reste anonyme, c’est peut-être le peuple lui-même qui, d’une façon ironique (en se distanciant de lui-même), constate *comme quoi*. . . . La syntaxe est la même que dans des titres de chapitre: ‘[ici on nous dit] Comment la peur . . . est le commencement. . . .’ Nous avons ici une analogie frappante du *que* du style ‘gendarme’ en français (*que* en commencement de phrase = ‘[on rapporte] que’) et du *que* ‘narratif’ espagnol (*que muerto se quedó en la calle* = ‘dicen que’), dont j’ai traité dans *Revista de filología hisp.* iv, 105. Au lieu de donner la maxime seule, on introduit un individu parlant fictif, sorte de spectateur ironique qui voit la situation de haut et de loin, et dont l’opinion sera, de ce chef, plus balancée et plus juste. Bien entendu, cette conclusion ironique n’est à sa place que dans la parlure familière: on n’imagine pas un *comme quoi* dans le résumé d’un traité de physique!

Si mon explication est juste, nous trouvons ici un cas remar-

⁶ Sur l’histoire de la déchéance de *comme quoi* cf. Brunot, *Hist. d. l. langue fr.* vi, 2, p. 1438: “*Comme quoi* a été condamné par l’Académie en 1704. Voltaire le chasse de la tragédie . . . Féraud [fin du XVIII^e siècle] . . . l’accepte dans le style familier (Mariv., Gresset), et même . . . le préfère à *comment* dans le style bâdin ou critique (Linguet). Reléguée aussi par A^e [la 5^e éd. du dict. de l’Académie, 1798] dans le st.[yle] f.[amilier] l’interrogation directe: *Comme quoi avez-vous fait cela?* ainsi que disent encore “quelques-uns.”

quable de la survivance d'une nuance psychologique antérieure à la grammaticalisation du tour d'expressions: *comme quoi?* était né dans la question étonnée et c'est cet étonnement qui subsiste encore dans la parlure familière et "distanciée" d'aujourd'hui, dans laquelle *comme quoi* est devenu, au point de vue grammatical, équivalent à un 'que' (*elle racontait comme quoi; comme quoi "la peur du gendarme" . . .!*). La nuance sémantique de la tournure contemporaine s'explique par son historique: la vue diachronique et la vue synchronique se complètent l'une l'autre, comme dans tants de problèmes de linguistique.

LEO SPITZER

A PHASE OF PEREDA'S WRITINGS IN IMITATION OF BALZAC

Pereda was a staunch nationalist, when not more specifically a regionalist, and was fond of ridiculing his countrymen's imitation of French styles, both as to social manners and literary practices. Yet Pereda himself was not free of French influence in his writing. In the main, the influence is remote and can be seen only in general characteristics common to writers of the realistic period. There is one particular kind of writing, however, in which imitation of the French is clear and specific. This is the analytical essay or treatise, satirical in nature, for which Balzac's *physiologies* of marriage serve as Pereda's models. Interest centers primarily on the similarity of technique in the two writers, since they have little in common as regards ideas, attitudes, and objectives.

The pseudo-scientific treatise was one of two essentially different kinds of *physiologies* which flourished in France in the third and fourth decades of the nineteenth century. The other was the analysis of a social type, not as an individual, but as an abstract representative embodying traits common to an entire group.¹

¹ Both forms reflect the nineteenth-century interest in science; the first by its methodical, "scholarly" procedure, and the second by its imitation of biological investigation, that is, by its study of a social type much as a biologist would examine a species in the animal kingdom. The writing of *physiologies* became a veritable literary fad in France around 1840. In many cases the genre was merely a sportive exercise of little literary consequence. Many writers, however, especially of the analyses of types,

Balzac and Pereda wrote *physiologies* of the second kind, but the resemblance of the two writers to each other is not so specific as it is in the case of the treatise. Most likely, in his delineation of abstracts types² Pereda was following the French through a form of Spanish *costumbrismo* patterned after sketches such as those contained in *Les Français peints par eux-mêmes*.³ I confine my discussion, therefore, to the analytical essay as handled by Balzac and Pereda.

Balzac gives us an elaborate demonstration of the treatise technique in his *Physiologie du mariage* (1824-29). With professorial bearing he examines various aspects of his subject, taking into consideration causes and remedies for sundry flaws in marital relations, and presents his material in a systematic, factual manner as though he were making a scientific study. Like a student in research, he brings an accumulation of data to bear on his thesis, supplies statistics, and cites studies on related subjects. He resorts to a numerical listing of items to be proved, employs a question and answer method of investigation, and punctuates his dissertation with numerous axiomatic statements. With all its semblance of a scientific treatise, however, the book remains a literary essay written in a derisive mood by one who is posing as a philosopher of society. *Les petites misères de la vie conjugale*⁴ is also a *physiologie* of the dissertation kind. This work includes at the same time the technique employed in the analysis of types, especially through the presentation of exemplary episodes and the use of scenic and dialogue material to demonstrate the theory expressed by the title.

seriously undertook to leave a record of contemporary society. *Les Français peints par eux-mêmes*, 8 vols., Paris, 1840-42, is a good illustration of this objective. On the *physiologie*, consult: Paul Lacombe, *Bibliographie parisienne, tableaux de mœurs (1600-1880)*, Paris, 1887, pp. 122-36, and Édouard Maynial, *L'Époque réaliste*, Paris, 1931, pp. 40-47.

² Examples are: *Las visitas* (1859), *Los buenos muchachos* (1867), and the collection *Tipos trashumantes* (1877).

³ For example, *Los españoles pintados por sí mismos*, 2 vols., Madrid, 1843-44. For a survey of collections of this kind, see W. S. Hendrix, "Notes on Collections of Types, a Form of *Costumbrismo*," *Hisp. Rev.*, 1 (1933), 208-21.

⁴ First published 1845-46, though written in piecemeal form from 1830; see Charles de Lovenjoul, *Histoire des œuvres de H. de Balzac*, Paris, 1879, pp. 208 ff.

In *Fisiología del baile* (1863) Pereda adopts on a miniature scale the manner of *Physiologie du mariage*. The article is an attack upon the public dance, which the author considers a breeding place of temptations engendered by the devil. The author's analytical, academic approach to the subject and his procedure of writing a treatise on a debatable issue vividly recall Balzac's dissertation on marriage. In lieu of citations of studies on similar topics, he quotes from a theologian, repeats popular maxims, and even calls upon history, albeit in a loose and non-specific way, to support his view. Like Balzac also he states principles which he proceeds to demonstrate in proof of his theory, argues by means of questions and answers, and scatters numerous aphoristic remarks and professorial deductions throughout his essay. His summary of the question, "El baile es una república en que no tienen autoridad ni derechos los padres y los maridos sobre sus hijas y mujeres respectivas," and the subsequent *preceptos* under the titles of "Deberes de la mujer" and "Derechos del hombre" in their form and temper remind the reader of some of Balzac's numerous *préceptes* and axiomatic statements. Compare, for example, the following from the "Catéchisme conjugal": "Un mari ne doit jamais s'endormir le premier ni se réveiller le dernier," "L'homme qui entre dans le cabinet de toilette de sa femme est un philosophe ou un imbécile."⁵ Pereda, in fact, talking about the dance sounds very much like the youthful Balzac talking about marriage. Both give superficial and one-sided views of their subjects. But whereas Balzac is only partially serious, positing as he does some subtle observations on social relations and at the same time indulging in a humorous essay, Pereda is outspoken in a personal and prejudiced attack.

In two other short compositions Pereda followed the method of the *physiologie* in part. *Las bellas teorías* (1863) is both a narrative and an essay. By presenting a series of experiences of an idealistic youth, the author develops the theme of materialism in society. The story reminds one in a general way of *Les petites misères de la vie conjugale*, since it is essentially a demonstration, in an abstract manner, of a theory. It also contains the characteristic axiomatic remarks, in the form of a *resumen*—"El talento

⁵ *Esbozos y rasguños*, p. 7 (*Obras completas*, VII, 2a ed., Madrid, 1898).

* *Physiologie du mariage*, Paris, Calmann Levy, 1897, p. 82.

es el árbitro soberano de la tierra"— and a *corolario*—"Sólo los necios tendrán hambre y frío."⁷

La mujer del ciego (1870) is a moralistic essay attacking the modish display of women in public. The author states his opinions and proceeds methodically to substantiate his declarations. The composition resembles the *physiologie* in its argumentative style, its question and answer examination of the thesis, and its diffusion of authoritative observations. In a passage which bears a marked likeness to the general manner of writing in *Physiologie du mariage*, Pereda cites Balzac as an authority on marital affairs, using for his own purpose the latter's argument that, when a woman begins to assume independence in her own home and to disregard her husband's authority and opinions, she evinces symptoms of approaching conjugal infidelity.⁸

El buey suelto (1877) was Pereda's last and most pretentious effort in line with Balzac's *physiologies*. Although this novel does not follow closely the latter's treatises, its similarity to *Les petites misères de la vie conjugale* is clear. Apparently Pereda's intention was to use the method of *Les petites misères de la vie conjugale* to refute the doctrine expressed in this work. Declaring in his prefatory remarks that he has as much right as others to discourse fancifully on the subject of matrimony, he sets out in an "ensayo de fisiología celibataria"⁹ to prove that the life of a bachelor is one of misery, a proposition contrary to that of Balzac. Balzac takes a hypothetical case of a married couple with which to demonstrate the import of the title chosen for his book. Caroline is made to serve as a synthesis of wives as Adolphe is of husbands.

⁷ *Esbozos y rasguños*, p. 74.

⁸ *Esbozos y rasguños*, p. 206. The reference seems quite clearly to be to *Méditation VIII*, "Des premiers symptomes," of *Physiologie du mariage*.

⁹ "Dedicatorio," *El buey suelto*, p. 7 (*Obras completas*, II, 3a. ed., Madrid, 1899). Pereda undoubtedly had Balzac in mind in writing *El buey suelto*, for he makes a point in the course of his novel of discussing, through his characters, Balzac's writings on marriage. But he could have been familiar, at least by name, with other French essays on the same theme; for example with the following: *Physiologie du célibataire et de la vieille fille* by L. Couailiac, Paris, 1841, and *Physiologie de la vie conjugale et des mariés au treizième* by Arthur de St. Luc and P. Aymès, Paris, 1842 (Lacombe, *op. cit.*, pp. 124, 131). The first of these, a series of brief discursive chapters in light vein on the disadvantages of celibacy, has slight resemblance to Pereda's novel. I have not seen the second book.

The author writes an analytical essay much as he does in *Physiologie du mariage*, listing numerically various considerations and bringing in numerous aphoristic sayings and philosophical observations. To present a graphic view of his theory, he provides a catalogue of typical situations and episodes, *physiologies* in themselves, which serve more to illustrate an abstract principle than to tell a story. The narrative element of the book, then, is a thin thread held together only by the personages, and the book remains throughout essentially a treatise, although the second part, which shows the inevitable outcome of the marriage in question, does have something of a novelistic coloring.

In *El buey suelto* Pereda also takes a hypothetical case, that of a bachelor.¹⁰ He visualizes bachelors as a selfish group disdainful of marriage because of the evils reputedly accompanying it, and he calls his central character, Gedeón, an *egoísta* "en que se resumen todas las especies de egoístas."¹¹ He gives Gedeón's background, as Balzac does for Adolphe, and through the eyes of his protagonist he examines various aspects of marriage. Once Gedeón has decided to remain a bachelor, the author presents a catalogue of typical experiences, all of which expose the unhappy lot of a bachelor and "prove" the thesis. With the presentation of typical situations, however, the difference between the two writers becomes most noticeable. Balzac consistently treats the various occurrences with abstractness, whereas Pereda is concretely specific. It soon becomes clear that he is writing a novel rather than an essay, and as the experiences of Gedeón work cumulatively toward his own ruin, the author gives free rein to his liking for descriptive episodes, which include some *physiologies* of types. And since Pereda is more interested in telling a story than in writing a treatise, he does not regale his readers with numerous authoritative observations.

Although *El buey suelto* contains a few excellent scenes which display Pereda's talent as an artist in picturesque description, it is in essence a completely one-sided story, distorted to conform to a prejudiced viewpoint. Balzac, too, gives a one-sided view of his subject, since he presents only unpleasant aspects of matrimony,

¹⁰ F. Vézinet (*Les Maîtres du roman espagnol*, Paris, 1907, pp. 131-39) compares *El buey suelto* and *Les petites misères de la vie conjugale* but confines his remarks to the contents and general nature of the works without attention to technique.

¹¹ *El buey suelto*, p. 12.

but he maintains in his semi-serious vein more equilibrium than Pereda. With whimsical dryness he unveils certain disagreeable truths, but his mood is basically playful, and *Les petites misères de la vie conjugale* like *Physiologie du mariage* may be regarded as an exercise in humorous essayistic writing. Apparently Pereda started out with the intention of treating his theme in humorous vein, but, as he warmed up to his subject, his humor gave way to invective and sober moralizing, common faults in his satirical works. Thus, what might have been a fanciful *physiologie* became a sermon, which, with its baleful view of celibacy, was a defense of marriage.

Since there were numerous *physiologies* of the essay kind aside from those of Balzac, it is possible that Pereda was actuated by the popularity of these to write the compositions mentioned above. But he is closer to Balzac in the details of his technique than to the average writer of the genre in question. Furthermore, the fact that he refers to Balzac's *physiologies* in compositions (*La mujer del ciego* and *El buey suelto*) which bear definite marks of similarity to them, strongly indicates the French novelist as his model in this kind of writing. There is little doubt that he admired Balzac, though disagreeing with some of his ideas. Curiously enough, he felt no desire to turn an attack upon the latter until 1877 (*El buey suelto*). A possible explanation for this is that the controversial atmosphere existing in Spain and the intense interest in novels of ideas around 1875-1880¹² stimulated Pereda to participate in the trend of the day by contributing a thesis novel in defense of one of his favorite themes—the sanctity of marriage.¹³ In so doing, he resurrected a target of attack from Balzac's satires. He was well aware that a confutation of the theme of *Les petites misères de la vie conjugale* already existed in the same author's *Un ménage de garçon* (1842).¹⁴

Balzac's *physiologies*, although in a sense humorous essays, may be considered as forming a part of his general objective of studying contemporary society. Thus they fit into the vast scope of his

¹² See my article "The Spanish Novel of 'Ideas': Critical Opinion (1836-1880)," *PMLA*, LV (1940), 544 ff.

¹³ With *Don Gonzalo González de la Gonzalera* (1878) and *De tal palo tal astilla* (1879) Pereda completed a trio of thesis novels, embracing the three subjects on which he was most easily drawn into combat: the home, politics, religion.

¹⁴ Cf. *El buey suelto*, p. 158.

realistic method. Pereda had no such objective in mind. His *fisiologías* served merely as outlets for personal convictions. But they do display one of his important realistic traits as a novelist—an inclination to analytical and methodical thinking. He was fond of analysis in characterization, of a systematic presentation of his material (for example, in exposition and description), and of argumentation and reasoning in general. He found the *physiologie* peculiarly adapted both to his satirical mood and to his analytical bent.

SHERMAN EOFF

Washington University

BEATRICE'S EYES

After Dante's immersion in Lethe the four Cardinal Virtues lead him in front of the Griffin and tell him to look into¹ Beatrice's eyes, singing: "See that thou spare not thy sight: we have placed thee before the *smeraldi* whence Love shot his weapons at thee of old."² The later Italian, and most other, commentators resolutely combat the implication that Beatrice's eyes were green;³ and insist that only symbolic intent is to be considered.

Personally, I have no objection to Beatrice's having had green eyes; and yet for Dante to tell us so, in any fairly definite way, would be almost to violate his custom of never vouchsafing any concrete and objective description of her person. Almost, but not quite; for once, in the *Vita Nuova*, he arrests us with the words: 'Color of pearls has she, almost, as much as is becoming to lady';⁴

¹ Dante regularly speaks, especially in the *Paradiso*, of looking into Beatrice or into her eyes: cf., e.g., *Par.*, II, 22; XV, 34; XVIII, 8 f.; XXVIII, 11.

² *Purg.*, XXXI, 115 ff.: "... 'Fa ché le viste non risparmi: Posto t'avem dinanzi alli smeraldi Ond' Amor già ti trasse le sue armi.'

³ E.g., Venturi: "Agli *smeraldi*, agli occhi di Beatrice rilucenti come *smeraldi*, e che al mirarli ricreano; non ch' ella avesse gli occhi di gatto!" Tommaseo even guesses that Dante might have meant 'blue'!: "Agli *smeraldi*, agli occhi. 'Smeraldi': disse sopra 'giocondo lume'; o anche perché gli occhi di lei erano d'azzurro chiaro. . . ."

⁴ XIX, 11: "Color di perle ha quasi, in forma quale conviene a donna aver, non for misura."

this was written in her lifetime, and when both were in their early twenties, and was said with a boldness which never was to appear again in his descriptions of Beatrice. But there follows almost immediately a statement which adds a new, more covert item of personal description, and which has never to my knowledge been brought into relief: after saying that from her eyes issue glowing spirits of love, he adds: 'You see Love painted (*pinto*) in her face, there where no one can look at her fixedly'⁵—and this, the prose explanation tells us, means her 'mouth, which is the end of love.'⁶ This still looks rather abstract and intangible, until one realizes that it may mean, very definitely, her red lips: for red is love's "color." We took it for granted all the time that her lips were red; and we should have been more grateful to know unmistakably what color her eyes were, or whether her hair was blonde, like the Lady Petra's,⁷ or was dark—as would have been more becoming with her little-girl dress of blood-red.⁸ So what have we gained? What have we wrested from the secretive Dante?

Little; except two, which with Beatrice's emerald eyes makes three, colors: the familiar triad of the three "theological colors," white, green and red, which play so large a part, both explicitly and implicitly, in all Dante's work.⁹

So that again we wonder whether Beatrice's 'emerald' eyes were only symbolically green!¹⁰

HERBERT D. AUSTIN

University of Southern California

⁵ *Ibid.*, 12: "Voi le vedete Amor pinto nel viso, Là 've non pote aleun mirarla fiso."

⁶ *Ibid.*, 20: "... dico de la bocca, la quale è fine d'amore."

⁷ *Rime*, CIII, 63.

⁸ *V. N.*, II, 3.

⁹ See *MLN*, XXXIX, 340 ff., "The Three Garments," for another none-too-evident presentation of the same color symbolism.

¹⁰ There is a further tantalizing hint of greenness (or blue-greenness?) in connection with Beatrice's eyes soon after the *Purgatorio* passage: *Par.*, I, 65-69: "... I in her fixed my eyes, ... Within her "aspect" (gaze, look, vision, eyes) I made myself such as Glaucus made himself in tasting of the herb that made him in the sea consort of the other gods." Uguccione da Pisa ends his section on *glaucus*, -a, -um, with the sentence: 'That *glaucus* is said for green, or blackish, is derived from Glaucus god of the sea, for the color of the sea is green, and blackish.' ("Quod *glaucus* dicitur *viridis*, vel *subniger*, *tractum est a Glauco deo maris, nam color maris viridis est et subniger.*")

"SOUNDING BRASS"

Dante's two uses of the word *rame* both refer to antiquity: ¹ (1) the trunk of the Old Man of Crete, who represents the Four Ages of mythology, is of *rame*, signifying the "Brazen" Age; ² and (2) the hollow metal bull, work of Perillus, in which the Sicilian tyrant Phalaris burned culprits alive was made of *rame*: 'As the Sicilian bull, that bellowed first with the lament of him—and that was right—who had tuned it with his file, used to bellow with the voice of the afflicted man; so that, although it was of *rame*, yet it appeared transfixed by the pain,' ³ so the voice of Guido da Montefeltro sounded as it forced its way to the tip of the flame that enclosed him.

Two, at least, of the early commentators—Boccaccio and the Anonimo Fiorentino—say that *rame*, is a 'sonorous metal'; but, unexpectedly, they make this statement in connection with the first passage, instead of the second where one would look for it. The Anonimo says simply, 'Since *rame* is a sonorous metal; ⁴ but Boccaccio offers an explanation for the seemingly cryptic allusion: "since *rame* is a more sonorous metal than either of the before-mentioned (the gold and silver of the first two Ages of Man), men became more famous among themselves, and of greater renown." ⁵ This still remains rather puzzling, until we see that its source is in, or is related to, St. Jerome's explanation of the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, ⁶ which was the model for Dante's Old Man of Crete; Jerome says of the "brass" belly and thighs: 'This material (*aes*, = *rame*) is more vocal than all metals, and resounds afar with its ringing. And therefore in Daniel, in the image which was composed of gold, silver, *aes*, and iron, the reign

¹ As does his one use of *aes*.

² *Inf.*, XIV, 108: "Poi è di rame infino alla forcata."

³ *Inf.*, XXVII, 7-12: "Come 'l bue cicilian che muggiò prima Col pianto di colui, e ciò fu dritto, Che l'avea temperato con sua lima, Muggiava con la voce dell'afflitto, Sì che, con tutto che fosse di rame, Pur el parea dal dolor trafitto."

⁴ "Poi che il rame è uno metallo sonoro, . . ."

⁵ ". . . , siccome il rame è più sonoro metallo che alcuno de' predetti, divennero gli uomini fra sè medesimi più famosi, e di maggior rinomèa."

⁶ Daniel, II, 31 ff.

of Alexander and of the Greeks is indicated in the similitude of the *aes*, that the eloquence of the Greek tongue might be signified.⁷ And the basis and background of this pronouncement concerning *aes* is almost surely the Apostle Paul's famous verse: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal."⁸ Two centuries after St. Jerome, Isidore of Seville adds to his condensation of Pliny's remarks about *aes* a few of his own; among them: 'Of all the metals *aes* is the most vocal.'⁹

All of which shows: in general, that not only theological, ethical, and historical, but also literary echoes in the Middle Ages should be suspected of being scriptural; and, in particular, that St. Paul is probably to be given the ultimate credit for Boccaccio's remark about the meaning of *aes* in the Old Man of Crete.

HERBERT D. AUSTIN

University of Southern California

AN IMMEDIATE SOURCE FOR FAERIE QUEENE,
BK. V, PROEM

Not often can one see the actual mechanics of Spenser's borrowings. The opportunity to do so is, however, afforded by the Proem to Book V of *The Faerie Queene*, wherein Spenser turns to his own use certain ideas contained in the first few pages of Loys Le Roy's *Interchangeable Course, or Variety of Things in the Whole World* (London: Charles Yetsweirt, 1594),¹ a work otherwise quite opposed to the Poet's idea of degeneration.

⁷ *Commentariorum in Ezechiel lib. XII, cap. XL (PL, xxv, 373 (old 465))*: "Haec materia cunctis metallis vocalior est, et tinnitu longe resonat. Unde et Daniel, in imagine quae erat ex auro, argento, aere, ferro compacta, regnum Alexandri atque Graecorum in aeris similitudine demonstratur; ut Graecae linguae eloquentia signaretur."

⁸ I Cor., XIII, 1: "Si linguis hominum loquar, & Angelorum, charitatem autem non habeam, factus sum velut *aes* sonans, aut cymbalum tinniens."

⁹ *Etym.*, XVI, xx, 11: "Inter omnia metalla *aes* vocalissimum est."—Still two centuries later, Rabanus Maurus quotes Paul's verse, with a different explanation of the significance of *aes* in it (*De Universo*, lib. XVII, cap. XIV—in *PL*, CXI, 477): "In aere autem vanitas, vel inanitas fidei exprimitur: ut est illud in Apostolo: *Factus sum velut *aes* sonans.*"

¹ A translation, by Robert Ashley, of *La Vicissitude ou variété des choses en l'univers* (Paris, 1575).

Le Roy's book, which develops the cyclic theory of successive periods of growth, maturity, and decay, differs from many such treatises on mutability in that it rejects the notion of primitive perfection (the Golden Age, etc.) and argues that modern times have the advantage of ancient. Its method throughout is comparative and historical, the comparisons between nations and between individuals being made in a fashion somewhat suggestive of that followed by Plutarch's *Lives*. As a prime document in the history of the quarrel of the ancients and moderns it has received surprisingly little attention.

In the first of the twelve books into which the work is divided, Le Roy proposes to discuss the "alteration of all things in the worlde, together with the causes of the principall chaunges and varieties, to be perceiued as well in the superiour, as in the inferiour part thereof,"² and launches at once into an examination of the "wandring and inconstancie" of the heavenly bodies from the time of Ptolemy to his own day. In the course of his discussion he reaches the conclusion that the world is about to pass the revolution of the "great yere" of the Ancients, and that the changes attendant upon that event have left the present days in parlous state:

Neuer were the Sunne and Moone eclipsed more apparantly; neuer were seene so many comets, and other impressions in the aire; neuer did the Sea and the riuers so violently ouerflowe their bankes; neuer haue bin heard such earthquakes; neuer were borne so many and so Hydeous monstres: Neither hath there euer beene since the memory of man, so many and so often changes to come to passe in Countries, Nations, Maners, Lawes, Estates, and Religions.³

A hasty thumbing of the first few pages of Le Roy could, then, easily leave one in a mood to feel that the world was hopelessly topsy-turvy. And that is precisely the mood of Spenser's first stanza in the Proem:

So oft as I with state of present time
The image of the antique world compare,
When as mans age was in his freshest prime,
And the first blossome of faire vertue bare,
Such oddes I finde twixt those, and these which are,
As that, through long continuance of his course,
Me seemes the world is runne quite out of square
From the first point of his appointed sourse,
And being once amisse, growes daily wourse and wourse.

² Sig. Bl.

³ Sigs. B2v-B3.

It should be noted that on the same page with his gloomy prospectus for the immediate future, Le Roy mentions "the fables of . . . Deucalion, and Pyrrha," though not, it is true, in the connection given them by Spenser (St. ii). Still, the juxtaposition is suspiciously unlike mere coincidence; and as a suggestion dropped into the questing mind of a highly imaginative poet it certainly need not lead to identical use of figure.

Beginning with St. iv Spenser explains that the worsening of sublunary affairs is attributable to the changing positions of the heavenly bodies with reference to the equinoctial points, a change due to precession of the equinoxes.⁴ The poet reaches the zenith of his moan in Stt. vii-viii:

Ne is that same great glorious lampe of light,
That doth enlumine all these lesser fyres,
In better case, ne keepes his course more right,
But is miscaried with the other spheres.
For since the terme of fourteeene hundred yeres,
That learned Ptolomæe his hight did take,
He is declyned from that marke of theirs
Nigh thirtie minutes to the southerne lake;
That makes me feare in time he will us quite forsake.

And if to those Ægyptian wisards old,
Which in star-read were wont have best insight,
Faith may be given, it is by them told,
That since the time they first tooke the sunnes hight,
Foure times his place he shifted hath in sight,
And twice hath risen where he now doth west,
And wested twice where he ought rise aright.

Le Roy's statement of the idea contained in Stanza vii, though not agreeing with Spenser in the degree of solar aberration—the precise meaning of either is hard to determine—is cast in language suggestively close' to Spenser's:

The course of the sunne is no more such as it was wont to be in old time; neither are there the same points of the Solstices and Equinoxes: but within this fourteeene hundred yeres since Ptolomey liued, who was a most diligent obseruer of the course of the world, it is come neerer vnto the earth then at that time it was, about twelve degrees.⁵

⁴ Le Roy, sig. B3: "Moreouer, they say, that al the parts of the Zodiacke and the whole signes haue changed their places; and that the earth is remoued from his first scituatioun, being not entirely & absolutely (as afore it was) the center of the world."

⁵ Sig. B3.

For a parallel to the ideas expressed in St. viii, it is necessary to look a few pages farther into the text of *Le Roy*. In that section of the Fourth Book which treats "Of the Power, Learning, and other excellency of the Egyptians" we read:

HERODOTVS the historian speaking in his Euterpe of the Egyptians affirmeth. . . . That it was giuen him to vnderstande by the Priestes, that in three hundred fortie and one generations they had so many Kinges, and highe Priestes, and that in the space of one thousande three hundred and fortie yeeres, *the sunne had foure times changed his accustomed course, arising twice in the west part, and setting also twice in the East. . . .*⁶

The correspondence of the italicized portion of the foregoing quotation with lines 5-7 of Spenser's stanza could hardly be closer. Such exact correspondence of ideas and wording, especially when the passages all occur within relatively brief compass, should put beyond doubt the immediate provenience of Spenser's information. And if, as has been suggested,⁷ the proems to the various books of *The Faerie Queene* were late compositions, polished off while the author prepared his poem for the press, we may also catch a glimpse of Spenser hungrily bringing himself up to date on current literature.

One final word. *Le Roy*'s book has not, so far as I am aware, ever been considered—as it assuredly deserves to be—in connection with the Garden of Adonis⁸ passage and the *Mutabilitie Cantos*. It would throw much light on both.

JOHN LEON LIEVSAY

Stanford University

MORE IRISH WORDS IN SPENSER

Although the fragmentary version of Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland* printed by Renwick¹ from the Public Record Office MS is the roughest of rough drafts, it affords some

⁶ Sigs. H^v-H2; my italics.

⁷ E.g., by Josephine Waters Bennett, *The Evolution of "The Faerie Queene"* (Chicago, 1942), p. 48 (following G. L. Craik).

⁸ Cf., for example, sigs. Z3^r-Z4 of *The Interchangeable Course*.

¹ Pp. 258-63. All the quotations from Spenser discussed below are drawn from p. 260. Dr. Rudolf Gottfried informs me that these words are correctly transcribed from the MS in Renwick's edition. For Spenser's other Irish words, see *JEGP*, XLII (1943), 502-06.

idea of the extent of Spenser's familiarity with his subject. However it may be criticized in the light of twentieth-century scholarship, there can be no doubt that Spenser knew more about the Irish and their language than did most of his fellow Undertakers, and that some of his opinions were held by reputable Irishmen in Spenser's day and even later.

IRISH AND WELSH WORDS. Spenser's theory that southeastern Ireland was "peopled from the Brittons"² has been abandoned only recently by modern scholars. See, for example, Kuno Meyer's conclusion that "whether we take history for our guide, or native tradition, or philology,—we are led to no other conclusion but this: that no Gael ever set foot on British soil save from a vessel that had put out from Ireland,"³ or Cecile O'Rahilly's: "To sum up, the Goidels came from Gaul direct to Ireland, not across Great Britain."⁴

"as fyre is in Welshe Tane: in Iryshe Tuinnye"

"Iryshe Tuinnye" represents a reasonable attempt on Spenser's part to indicate the pronunciation of Ir. *teine*, the common word for "fire," which is cognate with W. *tân*, "fire," Spenser's "Welshe Tane." See further the comment on *teine* in *NED*, s. v. *Beltane*, and Vallancey's *Collectanea*, No. XII, pp. cxvi f. As late as 1747 the spellings *tine* and *tineadh* occur in the same manuscript⁵ almost side by side.

"an heigh lande in Welshe and Iryshe Tarbert"

Spenser seems erroneously to have associated *tarbert* with Ir. *torr* = W. *twr*, "heap or pile," hence his rendering "heigh lande."

² Spenser here follows Camden (*Britannia*, ed. 1590, p. 682; ed. 1594, p. 646): *ita ex Britannia nostra primos incolas commigrasse in aperto est*. From Camden, too, Spenser drew his opinion that the Irish stories of the *Leabhar Gabhála* are "mere fables and verie Melisian lies" (Renwick, p. 56); Camden's phrase (ed. 1594, p. 643) is *nugae Milesiae*. But see also Holinshed, ed. 1587, p. 49a65 ff. For a fuller discussion of the subject see my "Spenser, Holinshed, and the *Leabhar Gabhála*," *JEGP*, XLIII (1944), 390-401, particularly p. 396.

³ *Transactions Hon. Soc. of Cymrodonion*, 1895-96, p. 69.

⁴ *Ireland and Wales* (London 1924), p. 34.

⁵ J. H. Lloyd, *Gadelica* I (1912), 23, nos. 53, 54. Edward Lhuyd, *Archaeologia Britannica* (1707), p. 67, in his "Comparative Vocabulary" gives "Ignis . . . Tân; . . . Ir. Teine."

He may have drawn his assumption from Camden's "LITTVS ALTVM, vbi nunc TARBARTH, id est Britannicè *terra minus profunda*."⁶ But Ir. *toirbheart, tairbheart* (< **to-air-ber-*, Pedersen, *Vergl. Gramm. der Kelt. Sprachen*, II, 465) means "isthmus" or "neck of land."⁷

Two places named Tarbert must have been known to Spenser. The first, now Belturbet, appears three times in the *View* (Globe ed., pp. 616b, 652a, 664b). From there O'Donovan wrote in 1836: "Of the Town of Belturbet I find no record except that it was a castle built by Hugh Connallach O'Reilly, A. D. 15—. The ford which this castle commanded is called by O'Sullevan *Bel-Tarbert* and Latinised *Os Tarberti*. The castle was called by the Irish *Caislen Tairbeirt . . .*"⁸ The old name seems to have been *Bél Atha Charbaid*, "Mouth of the Ford of Chariots."⁹

But nearer to Spenser at Kilcolman was Tarbert in Munster, a seignory on the Shannon, Co. Limerick, which was constantly under dispute or discussion among the Munster Undertakers. It appears in an abstract in the State Papers which refers also to Spenser's own holdings.¹⁰

"Curve Cosh eribord is bothe Welshe and Iryshe."

Curve Cosh eri (sic?) *bord* appears to be a list of four Irish words.

(1) *Curve* is perhaps Spenser's anglicized spelling for Ir. *cuirm*, a common word for "ale,"¹¹ cognate with W. *cwrw*, earlier *cwrf*,

⁶ *Britannia*, ed. 1594, p. 635; rendered by Gibson (1695), col. 947: "called now, as it seems, *Tarbarth*; for there the shore rises to a great heighth (sic). . . ." See the explanation in Wm. Baxter's *Glossarium Antiquitatum Britannicarum* (1719), p. 154, s. v. *Litus Altum* (pro *Tarva ardh vel Altus venter*).

⁷ On the Scottish Tarberts, see W. C. Mackenzie, *Scottish Place-Names* (1931), p. 151; J. B. Johnston, *Place-Names of Scotland*, 3d ed. (1934), p. 307.

⁸ *Ordnance Survey Letters, Cavan and Leitrim*, p. 4.

⁹ *Ordn. Surv. Letters, Fermanagh*, p. 7.

¹⁰ *Calendar of State Papers for Ireland*, 167.45 (1592), p. 60; see also *CSPI*, 202. 1:79, 2:36 (1598), pp. 81-2, 145, *et passim*.

¹¹ *Cuirm* (used of an ale no longer brewed) was still current among the Irish bards after Spenser's time; cf. the poem by Art Og O'Keefe in "the Contention of the Bards" (L. McKenna, *Iomarbhágh na bFileadh*, II, 228, 6), where two MSS have *cuirb*. In Lhuyd, *Archaeol. Brit.* (1707), p.

cwrwf, *cwryf* (< Old Celtic **kurmēn*: see Stokes, *Urkeltischer Sprachschatz*, pp. 93-4). Again, it may be that Spenser's attention was drawn to the Welsh *cwrwf* while reading Camden.¹² The first three editions of the *Britannia* (cf. ed. 1590, p. 21) have: "Cervisia ad Keirch, i. auenam, è qua potum illum Britanni multis in locis conficiunt." But the 1594 edition adds to this (p. 20): "vel potius ad *Cwrwf*, i. quam *Alam* [English "ale"] dicimus."

(2) *Cosh* stands for Ir. *cos*, g. *coise*, "foot," cognate with W. *coes* (cf. Lat. *coxa*). See Stokes, *Urkelt. Sprachschatz*, p. 89. *Cosh* appears in the Irish place-name *Cois Máighe*, Spenser's "our rich Coshma, / Now made of Maa," *CCCHA* 522. *Cois* (pronounced *Cosh* or *Cush*) is a dative form meaning "at the foot (of), beside"; *Cois Máighe* thus means "beside (or along) the Maigue River." Due east of Tarbert, it was called also *Mag Máighe*, "the plain of the Maigue." Adare in Coshma was held on a 21-year lease by Sir Henry Wallop from 1586 until his death in 1599. See *CSPI*, 127.28 (1586), etc.

(3) *Eri* offers several possible solutions, from which it is impossible to select the word Spenser intended. It is most likely that he was thinking of Eire (*Ériu*, g. *Érenn*), the name for Ireland,¹³ and what has generally been considered its Welsh cognate *Iwerddon*.¹⁴ But there are other possibilities. He may have meant W.

47, the entry "Cervisia, Kurv, kuruv, 'Ale, Beer,'" omits Ir. *cuirm*, which appears later (p. 160), s. v. *Symposium*, as "koirm."

¹² Gottfried, *ELH*, x (1943), 122, has shown that Spenser used either the 1590 or 1594 edition of the *Britannia*; on other grounds I had already concluded that he used the 1594 edition.

¹³ This spelling of *Eire* is found as late as 1822, when O'Connor's *Chronicles of Eri* appeared in London. More significant is the fact that Sir James Ware, who published Spenser's *View* in 1633, also uses this form of the word in his opening discussion of the names for Ireland; cf. *Antiquitates Hibernicae*, 2d ed., 1658, p. 2: *Ex alterutro fonte [Hiar "the West" or Iberis] emanare videntur Ierne, Hierna, Juverna, Iris, Bernia, Overnia, & vox Hibernica, Eri: His enim nominibus Hibernia olim etiam vocabatur. Ab Eri, Hibernus Erigena dicitur, & ita olim Johannes Scotus, Scriptor antiquus seculi noni, Erigena vulgo appellabatur. Sunt qui ab Ebero Hispano, uno è Milesii filiis, alii, qui ab Herimone Eberi fratre ducant.*

¹⁴ See J. Morris-Jones, *Welsh Grammar*, 77, 153; Pedersen, *Vergl. Gramm. der Kelt. Sprachen*, II, 109. The most satisfactory discussion of the name *Ériu* is by O'Rahilly, in *Ériu*, XIV (1943), 7-28; on W. *Iwerddon*

eira, "snow" = Ir. *oidhre*, which however means "ice."¹⁵ It is conceivable that he had in mind Ir. *áirem*, later *áireamh*, "number," cognate with W. *eirif*; if so, he should have anglicized it *erif*. It is not likely that he intended *Cosheri*, which is elsewhere in the *View* spelled *Cosherie*, *Cossirh*,¹⁶ as Ir. *cóisir* (*JEGP*, XLII, 503) has no Welsh cognate. Nor has *eire*, "burden" (*Lhuyd*, 1707; *Dinneen*: *eire*, *eireadh*).

(4) Ir. *bord*, "table," is W. *bwrdd*. Both are early borrowings from OE. *bord*.¹⁷ In his own poetry Spenser preferred *bord* to *table* (< Lat. *tabula*), which in its present sense in English came into use as early as the fourteenth century.

IRISH AND SAXON WORDS. Spenser's theory that "Irelande received mucze people afterwarde from the Saxons" has more to recommend it than has his theory of British migration. But he could have selected better examples of words which Irish and "Saxon" had in common.

"Marh in Saxon is a horse, marrah in Iryshe is a horseman."

This statement is substantially correct. "Marh in Saxon" is OE. *mearh*, g. *mēares*; "marrah in Iryshe" is Ir. *marcach*, g. *marcaigh*.¹⁸ For exact parallelism Spenser should have compared Ir. *marc*, g. *mairc*, "horse." There is no OE. word cognate with Ir. *marcach*, which is inadequately represented by Spenser's "marrah."

"to ryde] in Iryshe is *gemanus* and so in Saxon, or a commen person."

see pp. 9-11. Before Spenser wrote his *View* the names for Ireland were much discussed by Holinshed, Camden, and other writers.

¹⁵ *Dinneen, Irish-English Dictionary* (1927), s. v. *oighear*, *oighreadh*. The pronunciation of earlier Ir. *aighreadh* could be expected to approximate Spenser's *eri*. *Lhuyd, op. cit.* (1707), p. 4, has the entry: "W. *Eira*, *Snow*; Ir. *Erōg* & *Oireōg*, *Ice*."

¹⁶ *Renwick*, p. 46; *Globe ed.*, p. 623b. Though the reading *Cosheri* would seem untenable, it is worthy of note that the sequence *Curve Cosheri bord* consists of words that are all related to feasting. *Lhuyd* in his *Dictionary*, *op. cit.*, pp. 312 ff., explains *Coisir*, *Coisreach* as "A parish feast or wake."

¹⁷ *Stokes, Trans. Philol. Soc.* 1888-90, p. 428. *Lhuyd*, p. 160, gives: "Tabula, burdh."

¹⁸ Cf. also the rarer *marcaid*, M. *Joyst, Contributions to a Dictionary of the Irish Language*, Royal Irish Academy (1932), *M*, col. 63 = *Dinneen's* later *marcaidhe*.

There is some confusion here. The lacuna in the MS suggests that "to ryde" may belong with the preceding portion of the text. Was Spenser thinking of OE. *gemāne*, *gemāna*, *gemānnes*, "common, community"? (Cf. Lat. *commūnis*.) If so, there is no Irish cognate. OE. **geo-man(n)* (< *geong-mann?*) does not occur in extant texts, but that the word may have existed is strongly suggested by ME. *ȝoman*, *ȝeman* (cf. *NED*, s. v. *yeoman*). Ir. *gio-mánach*, "horseboy," is, as I have already pointed out,¹⁹ borrowed from English *yeoman*, which may be what Spenser intended by "a commen person."

Spenser's fanciful etymologies for Irish surnames in the P. R. O. MS have been discussed in *JEGP*, XLII, 506-7. Other defects have been noted by Renwick, pp. 263-5. But in Spenser's defense it should be observed not merely that the P. R. O. version represents discarded matter, but that Spenser may never have considered his *View of the Present State of Ireland* ready for publication during his lifetime.²⁰ Indeed, Spenser's restraint appears greatly to his credit when it is recalled that more than two hundred years after Spenser's death Charles O'Conor and Vallancey, who had far less excuse than Spenser, were being hailed as authorities in the same field by virtue of writing reams of rubbish.

ROLAND M. SMITH

The University of Illinois

¹⁹ *JEGP*, XLII, 503, s. v. *cuelle*.

²⁰ Renwick (p. 250) assumes, in connection with the entry of the *View* for publication in 1598, that the authorities "apparently forbade its printing." But there is no evidence that publication was forbidden. It is not at all impossible that Spenser was more interested in publishing *The Faerie Queene* and his other poems—certainly "among his first cares" (Renwick, p. 224)—than in going through the red tape of getting "further auuthoritee" for printing the *View*. Spenser, upon re-perusal of the manuscript, may have felt that it was not yet ready for publication, which he decided either to postpone or to drop.

WAD

One meaning of the word *wad* has escaped the attention of all English lexicographers and deserves resurrecting, if only for its occurrence in the ballad stanza that follows:

I launched my boat in Largo Bay
 And fishes caught I three:
 One for *wad* and one for hook,
 And one was left for me.

This stanza has been so long in my memory that the circumstances attending my introduction to it are completely obscured. I ran across the stanza, too, I feel, somewhere in my Icelandic work. Suspecting from "Largo Bay"¹ that the ballad was Scottish, I searched, as a matter of interest, though not exhaustively, through most of the northern and Scottish ballad collections. Some time ago I was rewarded by finding a variation of it in "The Fisher Lasses' Rant":²

We laid our lines in Largo Bay,
 And we got fishes nine;
 Three to roast, and three to boil,
 And three to bait our line.

This is the seventh of sixteen stanzas, each with a refrain. The gist of the entire ballad might be summarized thus: As a group of fishermen approach the shore, they espouse the tapster's lass, who seeing them, orders that her hose and shoes be cleaned and brought to her so that she can go down to see the bonny lad who has "laid his love" on her. The lad tells her she must sell her beads and her half-silk gown to buy "a fishline." The stanza quoted then follows. With the three fish reserved for bait they catch a big skate, which is put into the creel "till Saturday" to reserve as, or to barter for, the Sunday meal; but while they are dancing and making merry, a "customer" "customs" [empties] the creel of fish, and presumably there goes the Sunday meal.

Maidment states that he has taken it from a stall sheet, or

¹ Largo Bay is an inlet of the Firth of Forth, County of Fife.

² Maidment, James, *Scottish Ballads and Songs*, Edinburgh, 1859, pp. 50-53.

broadside, printed at Glasgow at the end of the 18th century; and that the original ballad has never been, as far as he could be certain, included in any collection.³

Be that as it may, it is obvious that the stanza in Maidment is considerably simplified in diction and content and must be a somewhat later version of one that existed in oral tradition from way back. The obscurity of the word *wad* plus the setting aside of part of the catch for the hook and *wad*—both seem now rather difficult to explain. As the ballad, of which this obscure stanza was a part, moved about, the divisions of the catch became the same three piles, but piles for roasting, boiling, and baiting.

The omission of this *wad* from Webster's *New International Dictionary*, the *NED*, Wright's *English Dialectal Dictionary*, Jamieson's *Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language*, and from all other and lesser works constitutes a slur upon a word of old and distinguished lineage, especially when one recalls the disembodied locutions that have been preserved in these works as part of the historical record of the language.

Wad here means "fishline" and comes straight from Old Norse *caðr*, which has two meanings in the sagas: (1) a fishingline; and (2) a line for measuring.

Webster's *New International Dictionary* gives these two Norse meanings out of Cleasby-Vigfússon⁴ in the etymology of *wad* but cites in the definition of the word itself only the second: "A line, esp. one marked in land surveying; hence, a track; trace; line of direction. Dial. Eng." It is the purpose of this note to show that the "fishline" meaning of *wad* came generally into the English language, too, for the use of it in the ballad points to a popular acquaintance with, or knowledge of, such a meaning at one time, and one would like to venture a wager that even now the word has currency in the speech of men who inhabit sections of Scotland and the outlying islands where Norsemen once ravaged and later settled.

Absolute confirmation of the meaning of *wad* in the ballad stanza does not rest solely upon etymological grounds, however, for the same formula or ritual used in dividing or reckoning the catch

³ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

⁴ Cleasby, Richard and Vigfússon, Gudbrand, *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, Oxford, 1874.

comes down to us in the Icelandic *Saga of the Foster-brothers* as the following excerpt will show:⁵

Óláfr konungr mælti: "Framarr hefir þú þá gert um vífín á Grænlandi enn fiskimaðrinn kallar aſlausn vera fiskinnar; því at hann kallast leysa sik, ef hann dregr fisk fyrir sik, enn annan fyrir skip sitt, þriðja fyrir öngul, fjórða fyrir *vað*."

[Olaf the king said: more hast thou done of killing in Greenland than the fisherman considers as compensation for his fishing because he believes that he has quitted himself of his fishing if he draws up a fish for himself, another for his boat, a third for his hook, and a fourth for his line].

To clarify this short passage lifted from the saga, I might add that immediately preceding this passage Thormod has been boasting of five killings in Greenland, to which King Olaf replies that hunting seems to have been good or the hunter daring, for Thormod has killed one man more than a fisherman must catch fish to prove himself a good fisherman or to feel himself rewarded for his labor and outlay.

Under the entry *vaðr*, the Icelandic dictionary⁶ cites another fish count: . . . draga fisk annan fyrir öngul hinn þriðja fyrir *vað* [. . . draw up another fish for the hook and the third for the line].

It is interesting to note that one fisherman counts his catch by separating it into three piles and another into four, but that in both cases the hook and the line come in for a share. This fact suggests an allotment for overhead.

This assignment of the catch to the "hook and line" is thus traced to the Old Norse Sagas and remains a problem, beyond the scope of this English note. Interest has merely prompted me to engage in some idle social and economic speculation.

Norse contributions to the English vocabulary are too well known to be more than noted here. The fact that the Oxford does not have this meaning of *wad* is not the first discovered omission, of course, from that great storehouse, but I should like especially to rescue *wad* and find a little niche for it by the side of "take," "they," etc., its somewhat more useful compatriots.

RALPH B. ALLEN

University of Pennsylvania

⁵ Ásmundarson, Valdimar, *Fóstbraðra Saga*, Reykjavík, 1899 [Íslendinga Sögur, Vol. 26], p. 118.

⁶ Cleasby-Vigfusson, *op. cit.*

ALYSOUN'S OTHER TONNE

An understanding of the structural dichotomy of the *Wife of Bath's Prologue* is essential to an appreciation of the metamorphosis of a sterile Pauline concept—"It is good for a man not to touch a woman"¹—into a work of art in the hands of Chaucer. With a modicum of seriousness and a wealth of humor, Alysoun astutely considers—through line 162—the validity of Church doctrines and prohibitions relative to the marriage state.² Chaucer's widow competently summons from Holy Writ and common sense evidence needful to refute important dogmas. The recital, however, is interrupted by the Pardoner, who confesses that the Wife's disquieting comments have left him undecided about the marriage question: "Yet hadde I levere wedde no wyf to-yeere!"³ She turns on the Pardoner and warns, "thou shalt drynken of another tonne,/ Er that I go, shal savoure wors than ale."⁴ No matter what the Wife had planned to say, she is committed to the task of supplying the inebriate Pardoner with "another tonne." Whereas Alysoun had at first questioned the Church's position on marriage as pronounced by St. Paul, St. Jerome, and later churchmen, she now gravitates toward orthodoxy in recounting "ensamples mo than ten,"⁵ which are designed to help the Pardoner solve the problem: marriage or celibacy.⁶ Thenceforth, the *Prologue* is dedicated to the estimable task of describing the situation likely to be encountered by the man *qui capit uxorem*.

¹ I Cor. 7: 1.

² St. Paul's equivocal evaluation of celibacy and marriage formed the basis of St. Jerome's argument against the wedded state in *Epistola Adversus Jovinianum*, a tract which represents fairly enough the ecclesiastical attitude toward women and marriage in the fourteenth century.

³ Chaucer, *Canterbury Tales*, ed. F. N. Robinson (Boston, 1933), D, 168.

⁴ CT., D, 170-1.

⁵ CT., D, 179.

⁶ The apparent reversal of intention can best be explained perhaps with reference to the poet's desire to fit the component parts of the *Canterbury Tales* into a framework essentially dramatic. But see R. F. Jones, "A Conjecture on the Wife of Bath's Prologue," *JEGP*, xxiv (1925), 512-547. Jones argues persuasively that the *Prologue* through line 193 was originally preceded by the *Shipman's Prologue*, and that the whole served as an introduction to the *Shipman's Tale*.

The *qui capit uxorem* convention was by no means new; however, Chaucer was probably the first to cast a woman in the rôle of the ecclesiastical raconteur who invariably renders the recitation.⁷ Theophrastus in *Aureolus liber de nuptiis* (quoted by St. Jerome in *Epistola Adversus Jovinianum*) had asked "an vir sapiens ducat uxorem"⁸ in preparation for a concise summary of the barriers to pleasurable conjugal relations. An unknown clerk in the Middle Ages used the convention in five lines of hexameters:⁹

Qui capit uxorem capit absque quiete labore,
Longum languorem, lacrimas, cum lite dolorem,
Pondus valde grave, verbosum vas sine clave,
Quod nulli claudit sed detegit omne quod audit.
Uxorem duxi quod semper postea luxi.

The *qui capit uxorem* introduction, probably as a result of the influence of Theophrastus, appeared in anonymous thirteenth-century French poems, which, needless to say, make no pretense of considering the question of marriage fairly. Hence, the convention in *Le Blasme des Fames* is purely an introductory device:¹⁰

Qui a fame prent compagnie,
Oiez s'il fet sens ou folie.
Fame si engingne et deçoit
Celui qui plus l'aime et la croit,
Et fet son bon et son plesir;
Ele se paine du trahir.

The *qui capit uxorem* poem which Chaucer probably had at hand during the composition of the *Prologue* was the prolix *Miroir de*

⁷ There is a strong possibility that Chaucer's assignment of the *qui capit uxorem* exposition to a shrewish woman is a delightful jest at the expense of the detractors of women who took their work seriously. This lecture given by a man of the Church, such as the Monk, would have been worth scarcely a second notice, but in the idiom of the Wife it is brilliantly ironic.

⁸ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, xxiii, col. 276. Likewise the Wife, *CT.*, D, 176-7, "Then maystow chese wheither thou wolt sippé/ Of thilke tonne that I shal abroche."

⁹ P. Meyer, "Les Manuscrits Français de Cambridge," *Rom.*, xv (1886), 339.

¹⁰ Achille Jubinal (ed.), *Jongleurs et Trouvères* (Paris, 1835), p. 79. Cf. *Des Femmes*, ed. Jubinal, *Nouveau Recueil de Contes, Dits, Fabliaux* (Paris, 1842), II, 330, "Quy femme prent à compagnie/ Verez si il fet sens u folye"; *Les propretés des femmes*, Meyer, *loc. cit.*, "Oez, seignurs, e escutez/ E a ma parole entendez./ Ki en femme trop met sa cure/ Sovent serra saunz honure."

Mariage of Eustache Deschamps. *Le Miroir* is a prodigious expansion of the *Aureolus liber de nuptiis* with borrowings from Jean de Meun and St. Jerome. Franc Vouloir, like the Pardoner, contemplates marriage; unable to decide the question for himself, he writes to the monkish *Répertoire-de-Science*:¹¹

Et pour ce qu'en ce po m'entens,
Envoye ces lettres a ty,
Et treshumblement te suppli
Que sur ce me vueillez rescripre
Chose qui me doye souffre
A congoistre parfaictement
Le bien, le mal ou le tourment,
Qui de ce fait se puet despendre,
Afin que de toy puisse apondre
Se c'est mon pourfit ou dommaige
De moy bouter en mariaige,
Ou de vivre sanz ce lien.

(ll. 1086-97)

Répertoire's reply is a catalogue of antifeminist sentiments accumulated over a period of many centuries, but it follows essentially the same pattern as Alyson's reply to the Pardoner,¹² who, like Franc Vouloir, would know the fate of one *qui capit uxorem* and who discovered on good authority, "Non est ergo uxor ducenda sapienti,"¹³ than which a better conclusion to the *Wife of Bath's Prologue* could scarcely be found. The prime difference between the polemical Latin and French works and the *Prologue* is Chaucer, who artistically camouflages a threadbare pattern with a merry account of a wife's adventures with five husbands.¹⁴

ARTHUR K. MOORE

U. S. Signal Corps

¹¹ Deschamps, *Le Miroir de Mariage*, ed. Gaston Raynaud, *Oeuvres Complètes*, SATF, IX, 1894, p. 38.

¹² Deschamps and Chaucer were indebted to substantially the same sources for antifeminist sentiments.

¹³ Migne, *op. cit.*, col. 276. Chaucer lets the reader make this deduction for himself. Of course, the Pardoner, like the "nuvel Gerusalemer" of *Couplets sur le Mariage*, P[aul] M[eyer], "Mélanges," *Rom.*, xxvi (1897), 95, could have observed at the conclusion, "Ne prendrei nule, ço est la fin," but it was hardly necessary.

¹⁴ *Envoy de Chaucer a Bukton* is a humorous *qui capit uxorem* poem. Chaucer fixes the direction of the *Prologue* by recommending it to Bukton as an aid to the solution of the marriage problem, "The Wyf of Bathe I pray yow that ye rede/ Of this matere that we have on honde" (ll. 29-30).

"CHRESTIENS DE LA SAINCTURE"

In a chapter from a symposium recently published under the title *The Arab Heritage*,¹ Professor H. L. Savage of Princeton University presented a condensed translation of the report on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land which a French nobleman, Ogier eighth baron d'Anglure, performed in the year 1395, together with some highly interesting notes and remarks.² On p. 209, the French passage (§ 170, p. 41) "Et sachis que Bethzel est moult peuplée des Chrestiens de la saincture plus que de Sarrasins. Iceulx chrestiens labourent les vignes ou iceulx bons vins croissent . . ." is rendered: "In Bethzel the Christians 'of the Girdle,' or Christians of St. Thomas, had become expert winegrowers." Christians of St. Thomas, as is well known, is a current appellation of an Eastern Christian community, belonging to the Nestorian sect, which settled on the northwestern coast of India and traced its origin to the Apostle Thomas, a claim which of course lacks any serious historical foundation.

However, the same "Christians of the Girdle" are mentioned on p. 216, together with the Jews, as having in Jerusalem "certain places and streets where they reside," which were separated from the sections where the Moslems lived (§ 168, p. 40 of the French text). And on p. 217 we read that "The Christians of the Girdle are recognizable because they wear the coloured *kafieh*³ of a blue shade, and the Jews a yellow one."

It is quite obvious that the "Chrestiens de la saincture" are plainly the native Christians, who under the regulations of the Islamic law were obliged to distinguish themselves from the Moslems by wearing blue girdles (Arabic *zunnār*, from the Greek

¹ *The Arab Heritage*, by Philip K. Hitti and others. Edited by Nahib Amin Faris. Princeton University Press, 1944.

² "Fourteenth Century Jerusalem and Cairo through Western Eyes," pp. 199-220. The title of the French original edition is: *Le Saint Voyage de Jérusalem du Seigneur d'Anglure*, publié par F. Bonnardot et A. Longnon. Paris, 1878 (Société des Anciens Textes Français).

³ This is not found in the original text (§ 174 bis, p. 43) which only mentions a kerchief (*faissel*). The French editors, and not the sire of Anglure, are responsible for the unfortunate introduction of the word *kafieh*, which is the headgear of the Bedouins and is not worn by city dwellers and farmers, as the Christians in Palestine were, and still are.

zōnarion) and turbans. The Jews had to wear yellow girdles and turbans. As is well known, this odious sign spread from the Moslem countries into the Christian.⁴

Professor Savage was misled by the French editors of Ogier's travel report, who in the "Glossaire" (p. 133) explain the expression "Chrestiens de la saincture" as "de la confession de saint Thomas, apôtre des Indes," and add: "Cette appellation provient de ce que saint Thomas reçut la ceinture que la Vierge laissa tomber en son Assomption." This misinformation goes back to the Italian report of the Florentine Simone Sigoli on his pilgrimage to Jerusalem, via Cairo and Mount Sinai, in 1384.⁵ To be sure, Sigoli links the appellation "Christians of the Girdle" to the legend of St. Thomas when he recounts (p. 94-5) his visit to the church of St. Thomas in Babilonia, *i. e.*, the town which the Arabs called al-Fustāt (from the Latin *fossatum*) and which was located near a Byzantine fortress known as Babylon; it is now called Old Cairo, south of the modern Cairo. He adds: "I Cristiani della cintura sono grandissima quantità di gente in molti paesi, e massimamente in India." Undoubtedly, Sigoli was misinformed by a local cicerone. However, he does not say that the Christians of the Girdle are only those who live in India but points out that they are found in many countries, and chiefly in India. Lacking accurate information about the Eastern Churches, he may have believed that all Eastern Christians belonged to the same denomination.⁶ Leonardo Frescobaldi, another Florentine who undertook

⁴ See A. S. Tritton, *The Caliphs and their non-Muslim subjects* (London, 1930), index s. v. *zunnār* and especially pp. 115-26. The subject has been recently dealt with in a most learned and attractive manner by Miss Ilse Lichtenstaedter, "The Distinctive Dress of Non-Muslims in Islamic Countries," *Historia Judaica*, v (1943), 35-52.

⁵ *Viaggio al Monte Sinai* di Simone Sigoli. Testo di lingua . . . per la prima volta pubblicato con due lezioni sopra il medesimo, una di Luigi Fiacchi, e l'altra di Francesco Poggi . . . Firenze, 1829. Strangely enough, Bonnardot and Longnon (p. x) ignored this edition, and mentioned as the first edition of Sigoli's *Viaggio* that of Parma, 1865, and as a second that of Turin, 1875. I have been unable to see them.

⁶ The editor of Sigoli, Francesco Poggi, although he was poorly equipped with oriental scholarship, understood the above passage better than the two French scholars, and in his notes (p. 148) correctly identified the "Christians of the Girdle" with the Copts. Another passage in Sigoli's report (p. 11) is almost identical to Ogier's passage on the colors of the headgears of Moslems, Christians, Jews, and Samaritans.

the pilgrimage together with Sigoli and left an independent report on it,⁷ had a higher standard of education than his fellow-traveler: on pp. 94-5 he gives a rather accurate list of the various Christian denominations in Cairo: "Cristiani Latini, Greci, Nubini (*i. e.*, Nubians), Giorgiani, Tiopiani (*i. e.*, Ethiopians), Ermini (*i. e.*, Armenians), Cristiani di cintura." Although he also explains this appellation by the legend of the Holy Virgin's gift to St. Thomas (evidently, his informant was the same as Sigoli's), he refrains from locating the "Christians of the Girdle" in India. On pp. 101-3 he states that they officiated in some of the Coptic churches in Old Cairo (and not only in that of St. Thomas), and on pp. 142 and 167-70 he mentions them in connection with Bethlehem⁸ and Damascus. In calling both the Copts, in Egypt, and the other Christian denominations, in Palestine and Syria, "Christians of the Girdle," Frescobaldi was quite correct.

Although the detection of the ultimate origin of a mistake which was carried over from the misunderstanding of an obscure Florentine of the 14th century to the 19th century editors of a mediaeval French text and finally to a distinguished American scholar of our days⁹ may present a certain amount of interest for the methodology of our studies, the proper place to deal with such a topic would not be this periodical. However, some readers of *MLN* may be in a position to answer a question which, through his ignorance of Romanic studies, the present writer is unable to solve. The expression "Chrestiens de la saincture" is not listed in any French

⁷ *Viaggio di Leonardo di Niccolò Frescobaldi Fiorentino in Egitto e in Terra Santa . . . Roma, 1818.* The editor, who is not mentioned on the title page, was Guglielmo Manzi. I was unable to see a more recent edition of Sigoli and Frescobaldi in the volume by C. Gargioli, *Viaggi in Terra Santa di Leonardo Frescobaldi e d'altri del secolo XIV*, Firenze, 1862. Nothing of interest is found in A. Gregorini, *Le relazioni in lingua volgare dei viaggiatori italiani in Palestina nel secolo XIV* (Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. *Filosofia e Filologia*, Vol. xi, 1896).

⁸ Here Frescobaldi seems to differentiate between the "Christians of the Girdle" and the Jacobites, although most Christians in Palestine belonged to that sect. However, other Eastern Churches were also represented there.

⁹ In a footnote on p. 209 Professor Savage quotes the opinions of Professor Hitti, the renowned Arabic scholar from Princeton University, and Mr. Khalidi (if I identify him correctly, a highly educated member of a distinguished Moslem family in Damascus) who both doubted the correctness of the identification of the "Christians of the Girdle" with the Christians of St. Thomas from India.

dictionary, as far as I can see.¹⁰ Was Ogier d'Anglure the only one who ever used it? If so, did he take it directly from an Arabian environment, or rather from an Italian source? Furthermore, how widely spread is the Italian expression "Cristiani della cintura?" Is it confined to Sigoli and Frescobaldi? An authoritative answer to these queries would certainly be welcome.

G. LEVI DELLA VIDA

University of Pennsylvania

L'érudit suédois Emmanuel Walberg a édité à deux reprises la biographie française de Saint Thomas Becket composée par Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence; une grande édition a paru à Lund en 1922 dans les *Acta Reg. Soc. Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis* et une petite édition a paru à Paris en 1936 dans les *Classiques français du moyen âge*. Les vers suivants font partie de l'épisode où Henri le Jeune refuse de recevoir l'archevêque à Londres et lui fait signifier l'ordre de retourner à Cantorbéry et de ne pas en sortir.

Comandé s'est a Deu, e puis s'en retorna.

Enz emmi le chemin, la u il mielz era,
Es viles e es burcs les enfanz conferma.
Del cheval descendri la u hum les porta;
En nul liu de servir Deu grief ne li sembla.

¹⁰ As Professor Spitzer kindly informed me, Tobler-Lommatsch, *Altfranzoesisches Woerterbuch*, has an entry "Chrestiens de la saincture" (s. v. *ceinture*), where the above expression is quoted only from d'Anglure's *Voyage* and wrongly explained, in accordance with the editors of it, as "Thomaschristen, Nestorianer." I am also indebted to Professor Spitzer for a reference to Du Cange's *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis*, s. v. *Christiani*, where "Christiani de cinctura" is mentioned from several sources from the early 14th century as referring to the Christians in Egypt and Palestine, and an almost correct explanation of this name from the girdle which they wore as a distinctive sign is given. I may call attention to the fact that Du Cange's reference to "Sanutus lib 2 pars 2 cap. 8 s. a. 1330" is incorrect. It should read "cap. 9," and the date, which in the printed text is 12** (*sic.*, with the omission of the tens), should be restored to 1249, since the historical event referred to is the capture of Damietta by Louis IX (see *Marinus Sanutus Torsellus, Liber secretorum fidelium crucis . . . Hanoviae 1611*, p. 48).

Deu servi volentiers—n'i estuet alumer—
 Par tut la u s'estut as enfanz confermer.
 Les chapeles poüm qu'i sunt faites trover.
 La fait Deus cius veer, surz oïr, muz parler,
 Leprus munder, les morz e revivre e aler.¹

Il s'en faut de beaucoup que personne jusqu'ici ne se soit occupé de l'interprétation du vers 4941. Dans la note qui s'y rapporte et qui se trouve à la page 294 de sa grande édition, Walberg a offert le commentaire suivant: "Je suppose qu'il faut comprendre ce vers comme une allusion aux chandelles allumées par miracle, à Newington, dont parle Guillaume de Cantorbéry." A la page xc de l'introduction il répète cette allusion, mais là il suggère que la source principale est chez Edouard Grim:

Quanto autem fervore fidei, quanto desiderii coelestis inflammatus amore redierit, ac si auditis quae quidem poterant terrere consolatus, testem tenemus gratiam sanitatum quae per illud iter coelitus monstrabatur, postquam ad superos sanctus martyr ascendit.²

Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence aurait amplifié considérablement le récit.

Walberg ne relève cet emploi de *alumer* ni dans l'un ni dans l'autre de ses glossaires.³ La leçon *alumer* se trouve dans le manuscrit *B* (de Wolfenbüttel). Le copiste du manuscrit *H* (de Londres) s'est permis ici un écart individuel mais vénial. Il s'est décidé à corriger le vers à son gré:

Beu servi volentiers, ne l'estut esluiner.

Autrement dit, dans le manuscrit-base il a dû voir *aluiner*, ce qui en effet est la leçon fournie par le manuscrit *C* (de Cheltenham).⁴ On n'a pas d'autres variantes ici, mais on ne peut pas douter de

¹ J'ai changé la ponctuation des vers 4941-4943 qui ont été imprimés de cette façon par Walberg:

Deu servi volentiers. N'i estuet alumer
 Par tut la u s'estut as enfanz confermer;
 Les chapeles poum qu'i sunt faites, trover.

Tout le texte de la petite édition est presque identique à celui de la première édition; cf. *MLN*, LII (1937), p. 285.

² J. C. Robertson, *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, II (London, 1877), p. 428; ce recueil occupe sept volumes dans la collection des *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores*.

³ H. Breuer, *Litbl. germ. rom. Phil.*, XLIV (1923), 366.

⁴ Id., *Zts. rom. Phil.*, XLIII (1923), p. 362.

l'authenticité de l'orthographe telle qu'elle est offerte par Walberg. Abstraction faite de la ponctuation, dans ce vers 4941 il ne fait que suivre ses devanciers Bekker et Hippéau. Tobler-Lommatsch, I 319, en citant notre vers, se basent sur l'édition d'Hippéau; ils le donnent à côté de trois autres citations: *Erec et Enide* 3644, *Le Chastoiement d'un pere a son fils* XI 52, et une chanson de Gautier de Dargies reproduite dans *Archiv für neu. Spr. Lit.*, XLII (1868), p. 322, par Brakelmann et encore en 1912 par Huet. Le sens donné par Tobler-Lommatsch, "(fig.) jemand entflammen," convient fort bien à ces trois poèmes où il s'agit de la beauté extraordinaire d'une dame et où il y a un régime direct de *alumer*, mais le vers 4941 de notre poème y est mal placé.

Godefroy, Compl. vol. VIII, p. 94b, sous l'en-tête *alumer* (absolu), cite un exemple apparenté dans le *Roman de la Poire* 436:

Si voi ge bien sanz alumer.

Il y en a deux chez *La Curne de Sainte-Palaye*, vol. I, p. 358a, qui offre une explication admirable, "le sens de ce verbe étoit encore absolument, lorsqu'on disoit figurément en parlant d'une chose claire et évidente:

Il n'i covient pas alumer.
Ci ne faut il pas alumer."

Le premier exemple est tiré du vers 551 de la *Bible* de Guiot de Provins; en 1861 Wolfart et San-Marte avaient essayé de l'expliquer par "alumer (absolute, *scilicet* ein Licht) anzuzünden." Le deuxième exemple est tiré d'une histoire de France conservée dans le manuscrit du Roi, cote 6812 (actuellement Bibliothèque Nationale, ancien fonds français, 146) et publiée par Buchon dans la Collection des chroniques nationales françaises, IX (1827). Enfin Littré, dans son historique du verbe, a trouvé une citation supplémentaire dans le *Roman de Renart*, branche XXI vers 150:

Ne m'i estuet point alumer.

Dans l'édition de Méon, vol. I, p. 361, on lit cette définition: "regarder fixement."

Cela posé, il reste à préciser l'acception absolue du verbe. On se rend compte que partout le verbe se présente dans une négation de la nécessité ou de la volonté d'approfondir le sujet. Il y a pour ainsi dire un sous-entendu psychologique qui est intentionnel chez l'auteur; il a envie de passer vite sur une idée; ce n'est pas la peine

de s'arrêter davantage; à quoi bon dire et redire ce qui va de soi? Le lecteur peut se passer facilement d'une explication détaillée ou d'une énumération étendue; certainement il comprend à demi-mot. Par conséquent on pourrait donner à ces cinq cas de l'emploi négatif de *alumer* la nuance "insister davantage, dire quelque chose de superflu."

RAPHAEL LEVY

Louisiana State University

READINGS FROM *PARISE LA DUCHESSE*

The thirteenth-century romance of *Parise la Duchesse* has not been edited since 1860, when it was published by Guessard and Larchey in the series of *Les Anciens Poètes de France*. The poem is preserved in a single manuscript, no. 1374 of the Fonds Français at the Bibliothèque Nationale. Numerous verses have become partly illegible over the years, and it has not been possible to recover the readings except with ammonium sulphhydrate. As this process restores legibility only for a limited time, it may not be amiss to record readings thus deciphered in Paris a few years ago. These should be of service to the future editor of the poem, although it should be noted that the copyists of 1860 were in general remarkably accurate.

The following pages have been badly blurred: 1r°, 13v°, 14r°. Incidental verses are affected on folios 1v°, 2r°, 2v°, 3r°, 6r°, 8v°, 9r°, 11v°, 12r°, 12v°. The verses reproduced below record all variations from the Guessard-Larchey edition which occur on the first three manuscript pages just noted. Ammonium sulphhydrate has been used on each verse cited in this paper. Line numbers are as in the edition. Suspension points indicate holes in the manuscript. Letters in italics represent obvious readings which, however, were not confirmed even with chemical aid.

Folio 1 recto

Hui maisi porrez oir del riche dux rammont	5
Qui fu dus de sa . . . gile et fu ml't gentilz hom	6
Bi. uacire et taracon et ualence anuirun	8
Li d . . . prist une famme qui parise auoit nom	9
.. not si belle fame de ci quen pre noiron	10

Qui soffri tante poine onques tant nen ot on	13
Herdrez et aloriz et tiebauz dap'ml't	17
Li dux tint vne cort a vne acension	21
Berengiers parla primes se as mis a raison	24
Et selle sapercoit son pere mort auon	31
Ja ne uerroiz ancois passe lacension	38
Nos seront de la terre et per et compeignon	39
Et nos comant dist m' la dame enherbon	40
A san pol de rauane apris unes poison	43
Dun uies masel p' il na peior es mont	44
Ses ont anuenimees dedanz mis es poisont	59
Cortoisenement lapelle sil la mis a raison	61
Amis parole a moi tu fus fiz au baron	62
Vnes chauces de paile soliers poinz a (??)on	66
Mais tu ne diras mie que nos ti anuoion	67
Volantiers a non deu li pautroniers respont	68
Dune part prist les pomes qui antoschiees sont	69
Et d'autre part la iuste ou estoit la poison	70
Il en uint au palais si monta contre mont	71
La dame ert an la chanbre a deu malaicon	72
Tote sole estoit ni auoit se lei non	73
Et vne chambareire qui anglentine ot non	74
A tant es uos venir I cuiuert de garcon	75
La o il uoit la dame si la mise a raison	76

Folio 13 verso (1918-36)

Et ie le uoudrai fort a mon espie boter	1918
Je ferrai berenger dit h' li senes	
Et li traitor ont les enfanz agardez	
H' dit b' uer moi an antandez	
Cla' sont uenu sozdoier adobe	1922
Je ferrai cel premier sor cel escu bande	
Antoine de cologne lait aler lo destrer	
Et ua ferir antoine le neuou b'	
Desor la bocle a or li a lescu percie	1926
La blane auberc del dos desrot et desmalle	
Tant com aste li dure labati dou destrier	
Puis eserie cologne ferez i ch'r	
Certes ni gariront li cuiuert pautronier	1930
Mar i firent la dame de la terre chacier	
Certes ell a I fil qui ml't fait a proisier	
Nest pas graindres de moi si est bon ch'rs	1933
Huguez de uauenice lait lo cheual aler	
Va ferir b' sor escu lite	
Desor la bocle dor li a frait et casse	1936
Certes ill a I fil qui ml't fait a prosier	1944

Folio 13 verso (1951-75)

Tant ch'r jentils et ocirre et paumer Et ceuz qui sont cheu les boeuz trainer Et foir par ces champs ces destries seiornez Dont li seignor an furet laidement trestorne A tant ez cla' jentement conrae	1951
Et ses IIII fiz bo ml't tres bien adobelz Il nen set que les IIII de tant est plus irez H' crie cologne franc ch'r ferez Certes ni gariront li cuuert desfae	1955
Mout fu forz la bataille et fiers li chapleiz B' et h' remonta et herdrez ses amis Duremant sont naure dex lor don encor pis Il sont venu tot droit deuant labateiz	1959
Li traitor desrangent set anforcez li criz Cla' corrent sore et ses XIII filz Par droite uiue force es portels les on mis An' ses trestorne a escrier ses pris	1963
Por deu ne fuiez mie franc ch'r de pris Qui or uosdra fuir de tant deu soit il maudiz Celle fiere parole les a toz esbaudiz A cel poindre qui firent an ont XL ocis	1967
Si em i ont bien XXX que retenus que pris La ueissiez estor et fort abateiz Ces hiaumes pecoier et ses escus crusir Et ces o'reilles et de si braz despartir	1971
	1975

Folio 14 recto

Des traitors ont mort iusqua XX ch'r Et san moinent batant iuqua XX ch'r prisoners	1985
	1986

Folio 14 recto (1991-2011)

De ci a uauenice ne finent de chacier Il entrent an la uile puis descendant a pie Il se sont desarme et si ont gaaignie Blans haubert et verz hiaumes et bons couranz destriers Et si orent conquis L ch'rs	1991
An la chartre parfonde les ont fait trabucher Il demanderent laiue sasistrent au mengier Li parages h' ni ont rien gaaigne An uauenice furent desconfit et chacie	1995
Lai trouerent le due desor le pont ou siet Delez lui sist sa feme la fille beranger A tant ez les traitors poignant toz eslaisiez Li dus voit lor escuz et troez et perciez	1999
Et lor aubercs trestot ronpus et desmailliez	2003

Et si sont tuit sanguant lor auferant destrier	
Il lor a demande don venez auersier	
Sire del uis deable qui nos out anchauciez	2007
A lla nueue ferte alames astoier	
Cla' le ueillart cuidames fors chacier	
Mais ill i sont venu serianz et escoier	
Par le mien esciant iusqua IIII m'	2011

The remaining isolated verses solved or verified chemically are as follows:

A lisue del moutier troua Rai' son sire	141
Dame por deu mon frere beuon si (????)	146
Li traitor lo seguent tuit XII less a les	202
Ml't i est maomez seruiz et honorez	210
Ancor na que deus anz que je sui eschapez	211
Je me uign droit a rome lapost' ai troue	212
Et vos mi corritz sore au le brac acere	293
He las parise dame bien uoi que morez	379
Li mortel traitor sont ml't desmesure	380
Droitemant an namor sont lo soir ostele	790
Qui ains de traision ne furent 'esgare	1188
Je meimes an sui si me uient per ae	1189
Dites moi mon parein que ie man sui ale	1281
De son lignage sont et de lui tinen fiez	1618
Antres qui que as gascoine ne si uout arester	1702
Seignor que aues vos dites por quoi fuiez	1705
I grant presant de pomes li firent aporter	1720
Pormain et d'autre chose furent anuenime	1721
San dona son serorje bueuon I bacheler	1722
Et bueues an mania qui ne si sot garder	1723
Il nes reconuit mie ce sachez de erte	1771

EDWARD B. HAM

University of Michigan

GEORGE HERBERT'S *SYCOMORE*

In "The World" Herbert writes:

Then enter'd *Sinne*, and with that Sycomore,
 Whose leaves first sheltred man from drought & dew

 The inward walls and sommers cleft and tore.

By *sycomore*, Herbert obviously means the fig-tree of Genesis, but

how he arrived at this notion has never been explained satisfactorily. G. H. Palmer in his annotation of this line says "The sycamore—perhaps through a false etymology—was often confused with the fig-tree."¹ F. E. Hutchinson, the most recent editor of Herbert, takes over Palmer's note with "considered, by a mistaken etymology, to be a species of fig-tree." The origin and extent of the error is explained by neither editor.

The difficulty begins with the Hebrew word שְׂקָמָה, which appears in I Kings 10:27, I Chron. 27:28, Ps. 78:47, וְחַשְׁקָמִים, Isaiah 9:10, וְשְׂקָמֹתָם, Amos 7:14, שְׂקָמִים. The same word also appears in the Syriac version of Luke 19:14. The Septuagint translators rendered the word as follows: Kings, συκαμίνος, Chronicles, συκαμίνων, Psalms, συκαμίνος, Isaiah, συκαμίνος, and Amos, συκαμίνα. It appears in Erasmus' text of Luke as συκομωραῖν. In Buxtorf's Hebrew Lexicon, the word is defined as "Sycomori . . . Ficus insitae castaneis, ficus heterogeneae"; and in Scapula's Greek lexicon the word is defined as *fig* or *sycamin*, "quod saepius promoro accipitur."

We now know that in the Kings and Psalms' usage the word means *sycamore tree*, for large numbers of these trees grew in the valleys, between Joppa and Egypt,² and that in the other passages it probably meant *wild fig-trees* or *mulberry trees*.³ The word passed from the Semites to the Greeks via the Phoenicians. None of this was known, however, to those men who rendered the Hebrew and Greek versions of the Bible into Latin or English in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

If Herbert read a Latin Bible, he found the King's passage rendered *sycomoros* in all but the Juda version, where the word is *moros*. The Chronicles' passage is *ficeta* in the Vulgate and *ficeta campestria* in Castalio's version, but *sycomoros* in the others. The Psalms' passage is *moros* in the Vulgate, but *sycomoros* in all the rest. The verse from Isaiah is *sycomoros* in all versions, and the verse from Amos is *sycomoros* in all save Castalio, who has *caprifarius*. Luke 19:4 is rendered *arborem sycomorum* by the Vulgate, Pagnini, Erasmus, Juda, and Beza, but Castalio gives *in caprificum*

¹ *The Life and Works of George Herbert* (Boston and New York), II, 226.

² Dioscorides, *De materia medica* (Wellman, Berlin, 1906-14), I, 115; Theophrastus, *Opera* (Wimmer, Paris, 1931), p. 59.

³ Prosper Alpinus, *De plantis Aegypti* (Venice, 1592), p. 23.

and Tremellius *in ficum sylvestrem*. The English versions are variable. The Authorized Version translates every passage as *sycomore*; the Geneva translates all texts as *fig* except the Chronicles' passage, which is rendered *mulberie*. The Bishop's Bible never translates as *sycomore*, using *fig* in Kings, Amos, and Luke, and *mulberie* in Chronicles, Psalms, and Isaiah.

We should expect Herbert to consult the Authorized Version, the newest and most popular rendering of the Scriptures. If he was struck by the constant use of the word *sycomore* in this translation and compared his texts with a Latin version, he might easily assume that this was the correct rendering of the Greek and Hebrew word. His error would be no greater than that of the learned translators of the King James Bible, and after all, they only err in part.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

The Johns Hopkins University

SHEVCHENKO AND PUSHKIN'S TO THE
SLANDERERS OF RUSSIA

Much has been made in various Russian studies of the admiration of Taras Shevchenko, the greatest Ukrainian poet, for the works of Alexander Pushkin. There was indeed the tribute of one great poet to another but Shevchenko's admiration did not extend to all of Pushkin's works and ideas. There was a profound difference of opinion between Shevchenko, who felt himself and his people enslaved by Russia as well as by the tsars, and Pushkin who could not help but thrill to the advance of Russian arms. The Russian poet in 1831 expressed his feelings in the well-known poem *To the Slanderers of Russia*, in which he defied the foes of his country to attack her or even to condemn her because of the suppression of the Polish revolt of that year. In this poem he used the celebrated words, "Shall the Slavonic streams flow into the Russian sea? Or shall it dry up? That is the question." (ll. 13-14). Later on he says: "Will not the Russian land arise from Perm to Tavrida, from the cold rocks of Finland to the flaming Kolkhida (Colchis), from the shaken Kremlin to the walls of immovable China, gleaming with a bristle of bayonets?" (ll. 37-42).

As is well known, in his poems from 1843 to his arrest in 1847, Shevchenko was decidedly critical of the Russian state. He expressed it in the preface to his edition of the *Kobzar* which was to appear in 1847 but was prevented by his arrest. At the same time, he was under the influence of the movement for a Slavonic brotherhood as outlined by the Czech poet, Jan Kollar, and as expounded by various other scholars as Pavel Josef Šafařík.

It is interesting that in his first poem on a non-Ukrainian theme, the *Heretic*, Shevchenko treated the burning of Jan Hus at the Council of Constance. In a long introduction to the poem written in 1845, he dedicates it to Šafařík, the author of *Die Geschichte der slavischen Sprache und Literatur* and the *Slavonic Antiquities*. It is not without significance that three times in this introduction he employs Pushkin's metaphor but with a strikingly different connotation, for he speaks of the Slavonic sea into which the Slavonic rivers are to run. Thus we read: "The Slavonic rivers flowed into one sea" (ll. 54-55) after the reawakening of the Slavs and of their sense of brotherhood. In an apostrophe to Šafařík, he speaks again of "Your new Slavonic sea" (l. 60 ff.) and finally he says: "Glory to you, Šafařík, because you called into one sea the Slavonic rivers" (ll. 69-71). There can be no doubt that in these passages the poet is directly challenging the idea of Pushkin that Russia must be the ultimate home of all the Slavs.

B. H. Khutoretska (*Pushkin i Shevchenko*, in *Velyky Revolytšioner*, Odesa, 1939, p. 111) makes a great deal of the similarity of the views of Pushkin and Shevchenko as to the Caucasus and the spirit of the uncivilized people there. It is hardly accurate, for in the Caucasus, Shevchenko fully takes the side of the people of the area who were struggling against Russia and says ironically, "From the Moldavian to the Finn everything is silent in all languages, for . . . it is happy." (ll. 92-94). It is an answer to the proud boasts of Pushkin in *To the Slanderers of Russia*. The whole tone of the Ukrainian poem is strikingly opposed to that of Pushkin's *Prisoner of the Caucasus*, which is a typically Byronic poem and which ends with the definite glorifying of the Russian conquest as a means of putting an end to the disorders in the mountains.

Pushkin's patriotic poem had aroused hostility among some of the Russian liberals and certainly among the Poles. Despite Shevchenko's dislike for the Polish state, his hostility to Russia was far

deeper and he could not resist the temptation to express it, when he had the opportunity to pay tribute to the dreams of a Slavonic brotherhood or to nations struggling for their freedom against Russian attacks, even if Ukraine was not directly involved. The examples here cited may seem small but they deserve more consideration than they have received in determining the relations between the greatest poet of Russia and the greatest poet of Ukraine.

CLARENCE A. MANNING

Columbia University

REVIEWS

The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems ("The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records," Vol. vi). Edited by ELLIOTT V. K. DOBBIE. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942. Pp. clxxx + 220. \$4.50.

This volume puts in the hands of the reader what is in effect a finely edited anthology of OE poetry ranging in date from *ca.* 700 to *ca.* 1100. The thirty-seven headings, some containing several pieces, e. g., those including the better poems in the Annals and the Charms, offer material of great diversity, reflecting many sides of pre-Conquest cultural life and intellectual activity: echoes from the Heroic Age, the period of Christianization, homely popular beliefs, religious devotion and exhortation, science of sorts, and history, especially that connected with the later Viking period. The gem of the collection is the *Battle of Maldon* with its Viking material handled in what one may perhaps think of as the best manner of the Heroic Lay. The volume also includes the difficult and fascinating *Solomon and Saturn*, recently edited by R. J. Menner with distinguished breadth of vision and range of erudition. The editor was likewise especially fortunate in having at hand Klaeber's summarizing work on the Finnsburgh Fragment, Norman's on the *Waldere*, the late E. V. Gordon's on *Maldon*, Dickins' on the *Rune Poem*, not to mention his own first-rate study of Cædmon's *Hymn* and Bede's *Death Song*. Though these and certain other poems have been considerably studied, many have received less attention, partly because they involve matters outside the scope of ordinary literary history. A most special interest attaches to the one real novelty of the collection, a hitherto unpublished poem on the *Seasons for Fasting* (230 ll.) of which a separate edition by Dr. Flower is

promised. The preparation of the Introduction and Notes obviously involved the digesting and organizing of an exceptionally large and, above all, diverse body of scholarly literature; this has been accomplished with common-sense and discretion. The properly conservative editorial principles established by Krapp for the series is continued. An improvement in the "Contents" pages is the expansion of the matter indexed to include "Introduction, Bibliography, Text, Notes"; this convenient feature might well be incorporated without great cost or trouble in any reprint of the earlier volumes, especially of the Exeter Book with its 35 separate headings.

Every reviewer, depending on his particular interests and equipment, will find odds and ends to comment on, details which he may be in a position to correct or sharpen up; there is material aplenty for all Anglists to work on for some time to come, for full interpretation of the past comes only slowly. In this spirit the following scattered points may be noted:

Pp. xx-xxi: the attribution of the Lat. *Waltharius* to Ekkard I of St. Gall is by no means a sure thing and of late the very century of composition has been challenged by that master of medieval Latinity Karl Strecker (in *Deutsches Archiv f. Gesch. d. Mittelalters*, iv [1941], 355-81), who would very much like to think of the poem as Carolingian rather than Ottonian. P. xxi, n. 1: the standard edition is surely Strecker's (2d ed., Berlin, 1924—a new ed. in *Mon. Germ. Hist.* is held out as a pleasing prospect); Althof is chiefly valuable for the Commentary in Vol. II. P. xxi, n. 6: Learned's reprints are published in *PMLA*, vii (1892), 1-208; this not unimportant bibliographical fact may appear somewhere, but I do not find it. P. xxvi: doubts may be entertained as to whether the *Waldere* fragments are bits of a long poem, i. e., of anything that one might properly call an "epic." At any rate, comparison with the *Waltharius* may be quite misleading, since this is very likely much padded in comparison with the OHG vernacular work on which it is surely based. There is, for example, no need to assume that the English poet knew more than the bare essentials about Walther's enfances, about details of the fateful banquet, perhaps nothing at all of poor Attila's bad hangover; the journey from "Etzeln bunc" to the Rhine might, for example, have been covered in a line or two. No such elaborate series of single combats, lengthy debates and challenges, horse-play and jesting after the final fight, are essential to the narrative. After all, cp. the Eddic *Akv.* and *Am.* with *NL*, cantos 20-38, or even better see Heusler on the "Baiwari-sches Burgundenlied" (*Nibelungensage und NL*, 3d ed., Dortmund, 1929, pp. 57-71) for a hint at least of the stage of narrative development and style that the Walter legend may have attained in England vs. the distinctly epic stage of the *Waltharius*. One needs not attribute to the English poet the dramatic tenseness or extreme economy of the Scandinavian poets in order to assume that we may

have the remains of a poem of "lay" length, say of some 300 lines. By and large I have little confidence that the *Waltharius* can give us any very precise idea of the stuff that inspired the English poet or of the substance of his complete work; it is, indeed, all too clear that the *Waltharius* does not match the *Waldere* fragments satisfactorily, otherwise such fundamental questions as to who on occasion is the speaker would long since have been answered.

P. xxxiii: Brit. Mus. Ms. Cott. Domit. A VIII (F) might better be described as "the Latin-English bilingual of the Chronicle, in some degree related to E"; on this same page, n. 1, l. 4, read "959 DE, also, slightly abridged, in F (English and Latin)." P. xxxvii, n. 2, first line, read: "called Óláfr Sigtrygsson kváran," and last line "to be Óláfr Guðröðarson." P. xxxix, n. 4: cite rather Sigurður Nordal, *Egils s.*, etc. (Rvík, 1933), pp. 130-48, and the Introduction, pp. xxxix-liii, for a full survey of the problem of Brúnanburh and Vinheiðr. P. xl, last line, read: "3d ed., Oxford, 1914." P. xlviii, l. 7: is there evidence of a "gradual" reduction of the longer to the shorter (younger) rune-series? In fn. 1, ll. 5-7, read "for a short sketch see v. Friesen in Hoops' *Reallexikon* IV, 20-26, more briefly still in *Encycl. Brit.*, 14th ed., xix, 662; for more up-to-date statements see *idem* in *Runorna* ("Nordisk Kultur," Vol. vi, Sthlm., 1933), pp. 49-68, and Arntz (*op. cit.*, p. clxii, below), pp. 97-98, 114-19, 146-52, 207-08, more briefly in *idem*, *Die Runenschrift* (Halle, 1938), pp. 84-89. Keller in a . . ."

P. lxi, middle: some mention might properly be made of the Gothic menology fragment. P. xc, n. 5: does not ON *þórðr* look back rather to *þórfrøðr*, parallel to OE *þurferð*? see H. E. Lind, *Norsk-isländska Dopnamn*, col. 1152-56, and Searle under "Thored" and "Thurferth." P. c, l. 24, read: "patroness, was abbess of Bede's *Strenashalc*, etc., formally to be compared with Strensall (YN), though apparently to be identified with Whitby (YN) (ON *Hvítabýr*) (see E. Ekwall, *Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, s. vv.)." Passing mention might also appropriately be made of the interesting point that it was under Hild's rule that the epochal synod of 664 (so-called Synod of Whitby) took place at *Strenashalc*. P. c, n. 3: the story in the *Versus* (ll. 20 ff.), supposedly prefatory to the OS *Héliand*, can scarcely be adduced as a "parallel," inasmuch as the narrative there is almost surely adapted from Bede; see G. Ehrismann, *Gesch. d. deutsch. Lit.*, etc., I, 160. P. cxviii: somewhere, perhaps rather in the Notes (pp. 203-04), the gist of Förster's discussion should be given. P. cxxiii, n. 4, last line: the statement of the case (in Smith and in Dobbie) is not quite right and should read somewhat as follows: "Dragmal may be an epithet based on the ON and Icel. adj. *dragmáll* (i. e., *dragmæltur*), "drawling of speech, long-winded." P. cxxiv, n. 3, last line, would be clearer if read: "of *Æðel-* and *Agel-* (i. e., *Ægel-*) would in this instance reflect the Norman substitution of *Ægel-*

for *Æðel-* in OE pers. names; see Zachrisson in *Introduction to the Survey of English Place-Names*, Pt. 1, p. 111, Note (pp. 111-12)." Pp. cxxxiii-iv: the Nine Herbs Charm bristles with difficulties and problems, for whose ultimate solution the services of botanist, folklorist, and student of Germanic religion (for the Odin verses) are likely to be needed. As Dobbie remarks, the charm is for an unspecified malady; it was, indeed, perhaps intended to be panacea, a blanket insurance policy. Suggestive material may be found in J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, xi, 45 ff. ("The Magic Flowers of Midsummer Eve"), esp. p. 58 ff. on mugwort, also in *Handwörterbuch deutscher Aberglaubens* under "neunerlei Kräuter." One wonders to what extent if any the Odin passage (ll. 32-33) reflects ophiolatry, with which Odin was associated; cf. Hoops' *Reallexikon* under "Schlangenverehrung," and Jan de Vries, *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte*, I, 121-22, 227 (§ 173), also 249 (§ 199) for brief comment on the present charm, and most recently Meroney, "The Nine Herbs," *MLN.*, LIX (1944), 157-60.

P. cxxxvii, n. 2: Grendon is misquoted; he translates (p. 169) *sigewif* by "victory dames"; on p. 216 he comments on the older rendering "valkyries." In view of ON *sigr-fljóð, -mær* "battle-woman, -maiden, valkyrie," OE *sigewif* might theoretically mean the same and be applied humorously to swarming bees. But it is unlikely that the English thought much in terms of "valkyries," especially considering the fact that OE *wælcyrige* itself, apart from glosses, seems to have merely meant "witch." *Sigewif* is probably only a playful epithet—bees victorious in having escaped, swarmed from the hive—and its formation and use here perhaps encouraged by the following *sígað tó eorðan!* "come down to earth, alight!" P. cxxxvii, n. 5, l. 3: cite W. Braune-Karl Helm, *Ahd. Lesebuch*. (9th ed., Halle, 1928), p. 88; the cited 8th ed. was published in 1921, where the text in question is on p. 85. P. clx: the somewhat imposing work on the Brunanburh site by Cockburn, Sheffield lawyer, should, of course, be included, but not without some tip-off as to its essentially comic character (see *Speculum*, VIII [1933], 85-87, esp. the footnotes). P. clxxxiii, l. 3 from bottom, add: G. P. Krapp-A. G. Kennedy, *An Anglo-Saxon Reader* (N. Y., 1929), p. 52 (metrical pref. printed as prose); G. T. Flom, *Introductory Old-English Grammar and Reader* (2d ed., Boston, 1930), p. 189 (metrical pref., part only, printed as prose). P. clxx, end; add now "OE Charm A 13: *bútan heardan báman*," *MLN.*, LVIII (1943), 33-34.

P. 138, I, 21 (*ætställ*): on this uncertain word add reference to *PNMx* (Engl. Place-Name Soc., Vol. XVIII, 1942), p. 17, under "Astlam" (earlier Estelham, Astelesham, etc.), standing perhaps for "hám by the *ætställ*"; *ætställ* still defies precise interpretation. P. 139, II, 3: the remark on MHG *vaz* is slightly misleading, since *vaz* only seems to mean "sheath" in the cpd. *swertvaz* (so Koegel

and the dictionaries); Koegel (*loc. cit.*) is wrong, however, in denying to OE poetry *stán* in the sense "precious stone, jewel." Elsewhere in OE, *stánfæt* renders in appropriate fashion Graeco-Lat. *alabaster* (New Test.) (cp. MHG *steinbühse*). In other OE cpds. *stán-* never means "bejewelled," nor do I find such use in MHG; Koegel's examples are all from *steinen*, vb.; cp. OE *stánan*, vb. also similarly used on occasion. An interesting parallel difficulty presents itself in Ms. *staim bort* of *Hildebrandsl.* 65, if this stands by assimilation of *nb* > *mb* (cp. *hlimbed* for *hlin-* of *Béow*. 3034) for *stain-* (i. e., *stein*) *bort*; on this see Braune-Helm, *op. cit.*, p. 196, note *ad loc.* P. 141, II, 23a: one would like to know more about the somewhat disputed *un mægas*, which, if it is the word or, indeed, a word, would presumably mean "unrelated person" (cp. OE *unmæge*, adj.) or perhaps "faithless, treacherous kinsmen" (so Dickins, Norman.) The real objection to *mægas* or *unmægas* is, it seems to me, that these do not make good sense in the frame of the Walter legend as we know this (Holthausen evidently felt some such difficulty which he attempts to resolve by his emendation to *mæcgas* "men, warriors"). Without joining the ranks of emenders, I should, however, like to emphasize the difficulty inherent in (*un*)*mægas*. If they are "kinsmen," good or bad, who are they? Was Hagen conceived of as a "kinsman" of Walter, a sworn brother? On his return home to *Ælfhere's* court Walthari of the Latin poem was received with open arms by all and ultimately succeeds peacefully to the throne (see ll. 1447-50). In any event, for this passage and others an ultra-violet photograph is badly needed.

P. 145, l. 192: the chief, perhaps only argument against *Godrinc* is not so much that this particular cpd. is not elsewhere recorded but that *-rinc* (similarly *-rýne*) does not seem ever to occur as a deuterotheme in OE pers. names (I depend here on the collectanea in H. G. H. Halvorson, *A Study of OE Dithematic Personal Names: Deuterothemes*, unpubl. Harvard diss., 1937), though *-rinc* is not rare in common nouns. Pp. 153 ff.: the Gothic words cited *passim* are letter-, not rune-names; the Gothic is, by the way, late, somewhat colored by OHG, and perhaps at times corrupt. P. 158, l. 67, at end: cite additionally an appropriate ref. to Jan de Vries, *op. cit. supra*. P. 158, l. 70: against an association of OE *heardingas* with ON *Haddingjar* is not merely the context but the form of the OE word (*heard-*), for the OE cognate of ON *haddr*, m. "hair" is *heord*, found in (b) *undenheord* of *Béow*. 3151; cp. also OE *heorde*, better *heordan*, f. pl. tant., "hards, hurds" (of flax). P. 159, l. 84: *yre* in *mid ánre æxe yre* of OE *Ann.* 1012 EF may be cognate with, or even borrowed from, ON *ýr(r)* "iron, metal" in *kald-ýrr*, *-órr*, a meaning that does not suit the present context. P. 159, last line: the appearance of the abbreviation (rune) * for OHG *ga-* is commonly thought to reflect English scribal influence; see Braune-Helm,

Ahd. Gramm. (5th ed., 1936), p. 9, n. 4. P. 198, l. 6 (*scepen*) : as I noted in *Engl. Stud.*, LXXIV (1940), 110-11, Malone's discussion of *Henden* (*Widsith* 21) is relevant here. P. 199, 1 (*uuiurthith*) : in *loc. cit. supra* I have pointed out the general unlikeness of *iu* representing a German attempt to represent OE *y*; it is more likely a mechanical miswriting of *ui* in the exemplar. P. 209, 2, 8: I should not alter Ms. *opone*, though *openu*, *-o* is, of course, historically correct; cp. *burhetone* "corroded" of *Béow.* 3049, and almost countless other instances in late OE MSS. of confusion in the orthography of inflectional syllables. P. 211, 3, 5 (*cweð*) : is *cweð* perhaps used impersonally, "is told, said," as ON *segir* (*frá*)? Finally I call attention to the editor's skilful retrieving of the Ms. reading for l. 12b: "ða lipu colian," too modestly hidden in the footnote to the text (p. 121, *ad loc.*).

Columbia University has every reason to be proud of the exacting task that Professor Dobbie has so successfully fulfilled, as have all students of Old Germanic culture to be grateful to him.

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Harvard University

French Syntax List. By RICHARD E. CLARK and LAWRENCE POSTON, JR. New York: Holt and Co., 1943. Pp. xvi + 271.

This work, which was published under the auspices of the Committee of Modern Languages, and is a companion work to Prof. Kenniston's *Spanish Syntax List* (Holt and Co., 1937), is described in the Foreword as illustrating "the adaptation of quantitative methods to the discovery of the most useful grammatical phenomena." The authors, in reaction against the "subjective" or "conventional" procedure of most makers of texts in their selection of forms, offer "norms for guidance in selection and arrangement that are based on a readily understandable principle of objectivity"; their own procedure has been to read and analyze sections of 60 modern French works of representative genres, classifying every "grammatical item" according to the Parts of Speech, each subdivision being accompanied by a statistical indication of distribution and frequency.

As the reader looks through this book, and turns over page after page filled with numbered items (of which there seem to be almost 3,000), he may be pardoned for experiencing a mounting feeling of dizziness. Even before he starts his inquiry into the meaning underlying this profusion, his eye will seek for orientation, for indications of some system of co-ordination. He will find for his guidance a decimal system of classification which, unfortunately, is most whimsically observed. For example, 4.95 (agreement of subj.

pron.) is, actually, no subdivision of 4.9 (redundant subj. pron.), while 4.9 is, actually, a subdivision of 4.6 (uses of subj. pron.), and 5 (dir. and ind. obj.) of 4 (pers. pron.). In such cases one could almost wish that the authors had simply numbered the paragraphs consecutively up to 3,000; at least such a system would not fruitlessly stimulate the mind to make the effort of co-ordination. Add to this the lack of an index, and the incongruities of allocation which are the result of having chosen a classification based on Parts of Speech—and the reader's desire for orientation is apt to be disappointed.

Nor will he fare better in his search for meaning; and this lack of meaning is due to two basic misconceptions which have determined the presentation of material. The first is the superstition of figures. It could of course happen, in individual cases, that the 'frequency' of a construction is revelatory, but to analyze the language as a whole from this point of view is a meaningless procedure; what can it possibly matter that the pronoun *la* is to be found 1280 times, and *le* 1176? And all too often statistics are used to replace interpretation, as when we are told (p. 106) the indisputable fact that the article is commoner than the Poss. with (unmodified) parts of the body (*Corbier releva la tête* vs. *Tu ne teins pas tes cheveux*). But when is the Poss. used? Is there a choice according to nuance, or are the two types distinct—as the two examples would (wrongly) imply? 1026 examples of the two 'types' were counted; one could wish they had also been analyzed. It is true that we do find, scattered throughout the text, perfunctory interpretations (a few of which are both new and important) of the single 'items'; and, usually, the treatments of the more general syntactical problems (e. g. the omission of def. art.) are preceded by quite sound summaries. But generalities are almost worthless as guides to usage in concrete cases: it is a generally accepted truth that, in the construction *noun + de + noun*, the second noun is subordinated to the first, representing not so much an independent entity B as a quality of A (*maison de campagne*). But in what ways is this truth true, to what extent? (may one say *porte de chapelle* 'chapel door'?) Under what circumstances is this construction possible? What are the (manifold!) patterns in which this tendency reveals itself? Any syntactical construction must be studied in the various patterns (each of which is complicated by different factors, and has its own set of associations, its own possibilities of development) in which it appears. And to discern these patterns is the main task of the syntactician.

This brings us to the second point, that of categories. The introductory generalizations are followed by a breakdown of the examples into the most mechanical, formal categories, with all too little regard for their relevancy or necessity. Where the problem itself is largely mechanical (e. g. the article with place-names) the

material is usually over-classified: to the familiar "continents, countries, provinces, departments, cities, islands, mountains, rivers, points of the compass" have been added "lakes and ponds; seas and oceans; squares, streets etc.; restaurants and cafés; parks; bridges; theatres, operas, churches, schools and other public buildings; other miscellaneous places." Again, why should the antecedents of the rel. pron. *qui* (subj.) be divided according to "person, animal, thing"—or those of *qui* (obj. of prep.) into proper nouns (*le prince Pepoli chez qui . . .*) and common (*un excellent ami, à qui . . .*)? To know what to reject is necessary for doing real science; the authors are evidently inspired by the belief that detail *per se* is clarification. But if, in describing my neighbor, I state that she has hair growing out of her head, and sometimes stands but more often sits, I have confused rather than clarified my picture (and have managed, somehow, to suggest a monstrosity!)

And this credulous belief in conventional categories becomes, in the case of the really problematic usages, a mental barrier, blocking the way to the discovery of the true categories—i. e. to understanding. Consider the problem offered American students by the 'non-reflexive' use of the Reflexive; the 7,000 examples which could have been studied as a guide to usage were broken down according to trans. and intrans., dir. and ind. obj.! And how welcome would be a picture of the Passive, subjected to such competition from *on* and the Reflexive! But the categories here chosen are the 14 tenses and the non-finite forms—which illustrate exactly nothing. Again, just what is the ground covered by the indefinable *on*? The material which might have been arranged to show this has, instead, been classified according to the forms *on* and *l'on* (further subdivided into *et [l']on, si [l']on* etc.). But it is the treatment of *noun + de + noun* which is the most tantalizing: throughout the section 'Def. Art.', which is divided according to Classes of Nouns, this construction keeps turning up—but, obviously, in categories where it can never be really treated: it makes no sense to discuss *un goût de fièvre* under Names of Diseases. Finally, however, under 'Indef. Art.' [!], the construction is faced squarely: out of the (literally) dozens of types which must have been represented by their 2,000 examples, they select one, the 'objective' *manieur d'argent*; the 'subjective' *rire de géant* and all the rest are lumped together under *maison de campagne*—and further subdivided (along with *m.d'a.*) according to whether the second noun is singular or plural. Thus in every case the real problem evaporates; one cannot say important things in unimportant categories.

By basing themselves directly on French literature, by amassing a wealth of material, the result of ten years' labor, the authors had the opportunity of presenting a picture of modern usage which would give the student an insight into the unity and diversity of

the structure that is French. No such picture is given, nor, probably, was it the intention of the authors that one be given. For the principal reason that no living entity emerges from this welter of items lies in an attitude on their part which is proclaimed in the Introduction of this work as its best guaranty: the fear of a "subjective judgment," the fear, that is, of the full-scale operation of the human mind, with its capacity for intuition, for evaluation, for synthesis: the capacity to seek and grasp the significance behind phenomena.

As a matter of fact, this work is evidently offered not as a book but as a pre-book—composed for the benefit of others who will actually write our grammars. But what is this benefit? What can another grammarian do with one example of *Oui, madame* (602 ex.) and one example of *tout se perd et tout se retrouve* (154 ex.)? He does not need the first; but, as concerns the passive use of the Reflexive, he needs all the other 153—and he must collect them for himself, making his own distinctions. As for guidance in "selection and arrangement of material," the list, given in the Introduction, of current constructions wrongly neglected, is undoubtedly of value. But the bulk of the material represents that upon which all grammarians are apparently agreed; is the text-maker to imitate the over-classification, dividing conditional sentences into 69 sections (two of which illustrate the fact that a speaker may be interrupted before he gets to the apodosis of his sentence)? The pedagogical value of such a procedure is questionable. This is hardly a practical guide, this work undertaken with so practical an aim. Some day, it is to be hoped, a grammar will appear which frankly boasts of being subjective and purposely incomplete.

ANNA GRANVILLE HATCHER

The Johns Hopkins University

Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric. By KARL R. WALLACE. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1943. Pp. xiv + 277. \$5.00.

From Bacon's remarks upon rhetoric in *The Advancement of Learning*, the *De augmentis scientiarum*, and elsewhere, Professor Wallace attempts in this book to construct as fully as possible a systematic treatise on rhetoric such as Bacon might have written had he undertaken that task. Thus nearly three-quarters of the study is devoted to assembling and analyzing Bacon's comments upon the various topics that would be treated in a rhetorical textbook. The author performs this act of synthesis with great thoroughness and scholarly acumen. The most illuminating con-

clusion that emerges is the pre-eminently Aristotelian impress of Bacon's rhetorical precepts—a conclusion deserving even greater emphasis than the author accords to it. For his analysis demonstrates that, although Bacon's ideas on some points have a close affinity with Plato's and on others suggest a debt to Cicero, a systematic rhetoric from Bacon's pen would have resembled no earlier treatise half so closely as that of Aristotle.

The last quarter of the volume, at the cost of some repetition, seeks to relate Bacon's thought to that of the rhetoricians of classical antiquity and of his own day, and to evaluate his positive contribution to rhetorical theory. Here the author forgets that, even though he has systematically arranged Bacon's random comments, the result cannot be treated as if it were a complete and fully considered textbook on rhetoric, and valid inferences drawn from Bacon's relative neglect of some branches of the art. Thus the absence of a discussion of forensic and demonstrative oratory does not justify the assertion (p. 207) that Bacon departs from contemporary opinion in assigning a dominant position to deliberative address. Similarly, Bacon's failure to mention the conventional division of an oration into its principal parts—exordium, narration, proof, and peroration—does not indicate, as Mr. Wallace implies (p. 213), that Bacon would have disregarded them in a textbook and substituted a "functional" treatment of rhetorical disposition. Mr. Wallace, in fact, seems to miss the point of Bacon's comments in *De augmentis*, vi, 2 upon methods of arrangement in discourse. Bacon's aim is to suggest some new and more fruitful bases upon which to divide the principles which may guide the development of a speech, supplementing those already expounded by Ramus and others. Hence his successive divisions, each on a different basis, into magistral or initiative, exoteric or acroamatic, by aphorisms or by methods, assertions with proofs or questions with determinations, and according to the subject matter which is handled. For Bacon's primary concern is to bring rhetoric into line with his program for the advancement of science, and he states explicitly that his remarks are intended to supplement rather than to supersede the teachings of the best rhetoricians. What he has to say on disposition is worth pondering, though his ideas were not developed by later writers. But the evidence does not warrant extolling him as the first to understand what modern theorists term the principle of "functional arrangement."

Mr. Wallace's tendency to overestimate Bacon's divergence from the wiser group of Renaissance rhetoricians who preserved the emphasis upon matter rather than ornament must be allowed for, but if this is done the reader can accept the general conclusions of this careful study. Inaccuracies of detail are rare. One is therefore surprised to find (p. 198) the title of Erasmus' treatise cited as *De copia de rerum verborum*. Also, the characterization (p.

153) of Ascham's style as "watery and flowery" is cause for wonder. Bacon applies these epithets to the style of Osorius, and Mr. Wallace, in a careless moment, must have transferred them to that of Ascham, whom Bacon mentions two sentences later as one who deified Cicero.

The student will be particularly grateful for the 25-page list of works on rhetoric printed in England and on the Continent between 1500 and 1700. It is the most complete list yet published, being considerably fuller than that in W. G. Crane's *Wit and Rhetoric in the Renaissance*.

FRANCIS R. JOHNSON

Stanford University

Thraldom in Ancient Iceland. By CARL O. WILLIAMS. The University of Chicago Press, 1937. Pp. 169.

It is not altogether unfitting, in the year of Jefferson celebrations, to write a word in appreciation of Professor Williams' book. The time may come—if it is not already at hand—when we shall hail the author of the Bill of Rights as one of the supremely great prophets of a brighter future for mankind, a time when freedom will mean more than not being in prison nationally and individually. The perusal of a treatise of such restricted scope as this one is yet sufficient to bring out in crass relief the fact that until the most recent times the vast majority of human beings has not lived at all, except in a biological sense; that the vaunted achievements of the race in ancient times all reek with the sweat of slave labor. Most humiliating of all, perhaps, is the sorry fact brought out tartly enough by the author that the Church, founded by the One who most ardently insisted on the infinite value and the dignity of the individual, lifted not one finger to ameliorate, let alone abolish, the institution. That was in the early Middle Ages. How about our South in the nineteenth century? The story is not edifying. Still it should be viewed on the background of the institution the world over. However that be, the present work is an excellent corrective to the notion that Old Germanic times were altogether fine and heroic. The saga literature was written by, and from the point of view of, the masters. Here we have the reverse to their obverse, viz., a digest of the many stray observations found in the sagas which help to show how things looked from the point of view of the underdog. Their general consistency testifies to the essential trustworthiness of the literature.

It should not detract from the great value placed upon Professor Williams' work if I point out a few flaws. In the interesting Bibliography I miss such standard works as Munch's and A. Bugge's *Histories*; also M. W. Williams' *Social Life in Scandinavia*

in the Middle Ages. It is somewhat peculiar that no edition of *Vatsdæla saga* was available other than the one by Werlauff, 1812(!), and that for *Hávarðarsaga*, *Gullþórrssaga*, *Kormákssaga* references are to the cheap and unreliable editions of Asmundarson. I take it as axiomatic that reference should be made, not necessarily to the most recent, but at least to the most accessible and, if possible, best editions.

Regrettably, the Baltic fairy story *Why the Sea is Salt*, related at length (why?), is attributed to Snorri. The translation of *Hóvamól* 37, used as a motto, is entirely misleading. *Skósvein* is best translated, not as "shoe boy" but as *page*. The *féhirðir* whom Skirnir meets in Jotunheim is of course not the "treasurer" but the *cattle herd* of the giants. *Auð in djúpúþga's* epithet unquestionably means 'deep-minded,' not "sensible."

LEE M. HOLLANDER

University of Texas

The Nuremberg Schembart Carnival. By SAMUEL L. SUMBERG. Columbia University Germanic Studies, New Series, No. 12. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. xii, 234. \$3.00.

Studies in late medieval German pageantic and theatrical history are rather scarce this side of the Atlantic. All the more credit therefore must be given to the author of this investigation, since the book is the first comprehensive and conclusive treatment of this subject. The few treatises available are not only not definitive, but are also apt to suggest false conclusions.

Sumberg's study is basically of a tripartite nature, dealing with literary, folkloristic and iconographic aspects. The Nuremberg *Schembartlaufen* was a shrovetide carnival, performed by the Nuremberg butchers' guild sixty-three times between the years 1449-1539. Well established traditions of pageantry and mumming underlie this carnival. There is the group of clowns and fools who clear the road and play tricks on boys and girls. Then come the heralds in their fantastic dresses, throwing nuts and perfume-filled eggs at the spectators. They are followed by the grotesques and devil-guisers, who in their fanciful costumes frighten young and old. The main masquers were the twenty-four to forty-eight *Läufer*, led by their captains (burghers), who were clad in contemporary costumes, embroidered with allegorical and geometrical designs, and who merrily leaped and danced through the streets, accompanied by the jingle of fife and tabor. In their midst they pulled an immense pageant wagon, called *Hölle*. The climax of the performance was reached when this tableau (castle, tower, house, ship,

dragon, elephant or bird) was attacked from all sides, stormed, and finally burned by the *Läufer* in front of the City Hall.

Basing his deductions on the study of a prime text (MS Nor. K. 444 of the early sixteenth century), the author analyzed the various aspects of this civic festival, the prototypes, history, meaning and names of the dancers and pageants. Of folkloristic interest are the grotesques and monsters, such as the Wild Man, the Wild Woman, the *Altvater*, the Indian, the Pig Demon, the Demon Puppeteer, the *Spiegelmann*, the Knell-ringer etc. The exhaustive chapter on costumes, their symbolism, colors, designers, patterns, paddings, hats, gloves etc. is accompanied by sixty miniatures and illustrations, showing the costumes of the dancers as well as the twenty-three different types of *Hölle*. No doubt, artist, book-lover, folklorist and germanist must feel thankful to the author for his scholarly analysis and clear presentation of the subject. It forms a solid and well-founded basis for related points of investigation, be it in the field of folklore (*Metzgersprung*, *Moriskentanz*) or literature (*Priamel*). The work is enhanced by a minute description and catalogue of all manuscripts extant which offer an iconographic record of this carnival. A rich bibliography concludes this valuable work.

CARL SELMER

Hunter College

Albrecht von Eyb, Medieval Moralist. By JOSEPH A. HILLER. The Catholic University of America, Studies in German XIII, Washington, D. C.: The Cath. Univ. of America Press, 1939. Pp. xvi + 220. \$2.50.

In his well-known book *Albrecht von Eyb und die Frühzeit des deutschen Humanismus* (Berlin 1893), Max Hermann definitely classifies Albrecht von Eyb (1420-1475) as a German humanist who embraced both the 'Gehalt' and 'Gestalt' of humanism. The works on which this classification is chiefly based are Eyb's *Margarita Poetica* (1472), *Spiegel der Sitten* (1472) and the *Ehebuch* (1471). Hermann's classification has become the *consensus omnium* and found its way into the histories of literature.

Encouraged by some reviewers who seriously questioned Hermann's statements, Hiller here subjects Albrecht von Eyb's works to a close scrutiny. His final deductions contradict Hermann's views in every instance. In contrast to Hermann, Hiller regards *Margarita Poetica* as a compendium of moral instructions, not as a rhetoric, the *Spiegel der Sitten* as an elucidation of good morals, not as a humanistic treatise, and the *Ehebuch* as an instruction on the marriage problem, not as a revolt against medieval ideas, which would regard marriage solely as a matter for civil authorities. Not

satisfied with a mere compromise by declaring that Albrecht, as the hackneyed expression goes, 'steht mit einem Fuss im Mittelalter und mit dem andern schaut er in die Neuzeit,' Hiller considers him a typical medieval phenomenon, a moralist and preacher, who strongly opposed all classically derived rules of conduct and education, so warmly praised and recommended by the true humanists. The author's research is of necessity conducted along philosophical and theological lines. Yet, the philologist will deeply appreciate his contribution to the study of German by his analysis of Albrecht's translations into German. His discussion deals with the following three works: Plautus' *Bachides* ('The Gay Sisters of Athens and Samos' or 'Two Tricks a Day'), Plautus' *Menaechmi*, which through Hans Sachs (*Monechmo*, 1548) and Jacob Ayer ('Comedia von zweyem Brüder auss Syracusa') leads to Shakespeare's 'Comedy of Errors,' and Ugolinius Parmacensis' comedy, *Philogenia*, written in the early fifteenth century in Italy. Of great importance is Hiller's discussion of three hitherto unpublished Latin *opuscula* of Eyb in prose: *Clarissimorum feminarum laudacio* (1459), *Invectio in lenam* (1459), and *An uxor viro sapienti sit ducenda* (1460). In the first *opusculum* he extolled women for their virtue (*pudicitia*), in the second he criticizes them for their vices ('procuress'), in the third he recommends marriage. Albrecht's translation is characterized by extreme reserve in risqué matters rather than by *Ehrfurcht vor dem Urtext*. Thus all vulgar, uncouth, and obscene expressions, which are found so abundantly in these works, are toned down and purified. The word *meretrix*, e. g., is never rendered by *Hure*, but by the gentle *pule*.

It is to be regretted that Hiller's book is not infrequently marred by misprints. Twice whole lines are set out of their proper places. Such mechanical details, however, quite likely to occur when large quantities of a medieval text are continuously interspersed into plain text, can detract little from the intrinsic value of this book. A special and general bibliography comprising some six hundred titles enhances the usefulness of this book.

CARL SELMER

Hunter College

BRIEF MENTION

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES extends its cordial greetings to *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, the first number of which appeared in September. Mr. G. A. Klinck and his associates seek to do for Canadian teachers what *The Modern Language Journal* does for teachers in the United States. There will be four numbers a year. Subscriptions of \$1.00 should be sent to Mr. P. K. Hambly, 23 Isabella St., Toronto 5.

H. C. L.

A Literary Journey through Wartime Britain. By A. C. WARD. Illustrated by F. T. CHAPMAN. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1943. Pp. vi + 96. \$2.00. For American readers, eagerly hoping for specific information about the damage done to literary shrines all over England, this will be a very disappointing book. Whether because of strict government censorship, or merely because of a lack of opportunity on the part of the author to gather the facts, the descriptions are often worded in the most general terms. For instance, we are told that The Temple Church, the Halls, and the Middle Temple Library have been "severely damaged," that the Westminster Abbey buildings "have sustained heavy damage, some of it irreparable," and that Horace Walpole's house at Strawberry Hill is now "a war casualty." But very little is said about exactly what has been destroyed.

A large portion of the book is given over to pleasant discussions of famous buildings and their literary associations, illustrated by quotations from well known authors. These might have been welcomed in peace time, but only serve to irritate a worried present day reader. We would gladly trade a score of quotations from our favorite authors for some definite word as to which houses have been damaged in the Royal Crescent at Bath, and as to the exact condition of Exeter Cathedral. The author does give some valuable descriptions of London ruins (the photographs are much more revealing than the text), and suggests other changes when he mentions the disappearance of the locked gates and railings inside the many London squares. But when the book is put down the reader is left with scores of unanswered questions. We still eagerly await more detailed word of what the Blitz has done to literary England.

JAMES L. CLIFFORD

Lehigh University

CORRESPONDENCE

VARIORUM SPENSER, MINOR POEMS. In *Modern Language Notes* for May of this year, Vol. LIX, pp. 336-342, appeared an elaborate but careless review of the *Variorum Spenser, Minor Poems*, Vol. I. A rejoinder is always a bore—a bore to read, an even greater bore to write. But this notice of the book is so misleading that, in justice to the editors and their collaborators, both dead and living, a correction is in order.

The review has at least done the volume the honor of minute scrutiny. Each of the 734 pages has apparently been filtered for every omitted period, every misplaced letter or number, every v for u, every missing

variant. An indiscriminate list of some forty of these, with hints of others, is made to look rather devastating. They assault the mind with mere multitude, like jungle ants, all equal, as if a comma were as important as a variant, a variant as a gloss, and all of equal weight with the integrity of a line of Spenser's verse. Hardly can the reader be aware that in all this sediment occurs only one important misprint in the 5200 lines of verse—"and" for "with" in line 86 of the first hymn—and two minor misprints; in the Gloss on the *Calender*, occur two, perhaps three, misprinted words, six misprinted letters, three of them v for u. Anyone who has ever struggled with the antinomy between a linotype and an Elizabethan text will not wonder. It is some comfort to find that by far most of the noted errors are minute, that they concern less essential parts of the book and do not qualify its usefulness as a variorum edition, however they usurp and offend the microscopic eye.

The magisterial, and sometimes invidious, tone of the review would perhaps be less unbecoming if it did not abound in amazing errors and mistakes of its own. On two of its pages are nine misreadings or misstatements. On page 338 alone there are 17 so-called "corrections" of which seven are wrong. For example, the reviewer asserts that the important variant in the September eclogue, line 257, "is not noted in the Variant Readings." But there it is, in its place, plain as print, on page 703. On one single page the review cites six alleged "misreadings" of the First Quarto of the *Calender*; in every instance the *Variorum* is right, the review is wrong. The reviewer seems in doubt about the Quarto's punctuation at *Dedicatory Epistle* 20.8; but she, and Professor Renwick, have only to invert a semicolon to see that it does not become a question-mark. The reading of the Quarto is unmistakable.

Such is the review's carelessness in detail. But "paulo majora canamus." Its more general comment reflects a misconception of the limitations and the functions of a Variorum edition, and ignorance of certain practical rules which must govern its editors. It takes particular exception to the omission of certain variants, but does not observe that the *Variorum* records for the *Calender* alone some eighty more variants than even the Oxford edition, the one which hitherto has given most attention to this matter. The reviewer does not realize that a point may be reached in the recording of variants beyond which by its very bulk and "minimism" it ceases to be profitable. She asserts that the collation of Quartos Two to Five is "entirely inadequate and also inaccurate," and "that the variant readings cannot be relied upon because they are full of mistakes and misprints," and that "there is a general tendency to misrepresent the readings of Q.3." All the quartos, however, were carefully collated, and such sweeping condemnation lacks support in the detailed facts, if anyone will take the trouble to examine them, and is discredited by the generally careless haste of the whole review. The importance of the variants to the question of Spenser's archaisms is highly exaggerated, as anyone who has compared the quartos knows; and in any case a sound student of the

matter would never depend merely on recorded variants, but consult the texts themselves.

Once the critic asserts the "unintelligibility" of a certain note in the Commentary. Most notes taken by themselves are unintelligible. Read with the text they concern they are intelligible enough. Hard upon this the reader is warned to use this book "with caution and intelligence."

Thus with hinted faults and faint praise and a certain consequential manner this review conveys an impression that *Minor Poems*, Vol. I is a well-meant but incompetent performance. Against such indirection the book can afford to stand as its own defense.

CHARLES G. OSGOOD

Princeton University

SOME NOTES ON OTFRID'S *Ad Liutbertum*. F. P. Magoun's text with translation and commentary on Otfrid's preface to his *Liber Evangeliorum* or *Evangelienbuch*, commonly referred to as *Ad Liutbertum*,¹ fills a long-felt want in providing in a form accessible to the English-speaking reader a new analysis as well as a review of previous scholarly treatments of this important medieval critical document. The present paper ventures to suggest a few amendments to, and correction of, his translation and commentary.

The opening sentence of the *Ad Liutbertum* reads:

Dignitatis culmine gratia divina praecelso Liutberto Mogontiacensis urbis archiepiscopo Otfridus, quamvis indignus tamen devotione monachus presbyterque exiguis, aeternae vitae gaudium optat semper in Christo. (Magoun, *art. cit.*, p. 872.)

This Magoun translated as follows:

To the acme of merit, Liutbert, archbishop of Mainz, exalted by divine grace, Otfrid, though undeserving, yet by devotion (to God) a monk and humble priest, wishes the joy of life eternal ever in Christ. (Magoun, *ibid.*)

Unfortunately this interpretation assumes a reading *culmini* vs. *culmine* of the text. Since we have an ablative and not a dative to contend with, I suggest that a more faithful and correct translation would run:

To Liutbert, archbishop of Mainz, by means of the height of honor exalted by divine grace, Otfrid, though undeserving, yet by devotion (to God) a monk and humble priest, wishes the joy of life eternal in Christ.

This translation corresponds to the proper grammatical construction of *culmine* as an abl. of means dependent on the "frozen" participial adjective *praecelso*, rather than as indirect obj. of *optat*.

A second and more controversial point is the meaning of *dignitatis* in this same passage. Magoun construes it as an abstract noun "merit." I am inclined to view it as a reference to the official dignity of the arch-

¹ "Otfrid's *Ad Liutbertum*," *PMLA*, LVIII (1943), 869-90.

bishopric. In support of the contention that *dignitatis* has a specific meaning may be quoted the following passage from the *Ad Liutbertum* (Magoun, *art. cit.*, p. 888): "*Hunc igitur . . . praesulatus vestrae dignitati sapientiaeque in vobis pari commendare curavi.*" This passage clearly indicates Otfrid's association of *dignitas* with the more secular aspects of Liutbert's distinction. Perhaps both abstract and concrete meanings are suggested by Otfrid's use of the word in his opening sentence, but it seems best not to overlook so likely a specific reference.

After discussing his treatment of the opening and closing parts of the four Gospels Otfrid goes on to say:

In medio vero, ne graviter forte pro superfluitate verborum ferrent legentes, multa et parabularum Christi et miraculorum eiusque doctrinae, quamvis iam fessus (hoc enim novissime edidi) ob necessitatem tamen praedictam praetermisit invitus; et non iam ordinatim ut caeperam procuravi dictare, sed qualiter meae parvae occurrerunt memoriae. (Magoun, *art. cit.*, p. 877.)

Magoun, following Bork, professes to find the passage self-contradictory, probably in the belief that a *cacoethes scribendi* leads to fatigue. Yet the old paradox about its being harder to say one's say in one page than in ten may well be applicable here. Otfrid seems to have felt the labors of concision and memory to be more of a burden than a comparatively straightforward though more detailed following of a source propped up before him. A further possibility is that Otfrid might have already completed a thoroughly elaborate and complete middle section only to meet with the objections of friends (ep. Tasso and Tennyson) that it was too long and then in deference to their wishes set himself to excise a sufficient amount of material to meet their objections.

ALAN J. ANSEN

Woodmere, N. Y.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Campbell, Joseph, and Robinson, Henry Morton.—A skeleton key to *Finnegan's wake*. *New York*: Harcourt, Brace, 1944. Pp. xiv + 365. \$3.50.

Combs, W. F.—O Inglês simplificado. *Philadelphia*: David McKay, 1944. 169 pp.

Evans, Bergen and Mohr, George J.—The psychiatry of Robert Burton. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1944. Pp. xii + 129. \$2.00.

Fairchild, Arthur H. R.—Shakespeare and the tragic theme. *Columbia*: U. of Missouri Press, 1944. Pp. 145. \$1.50. (U. of Missouri Studies, XIX, 2.)

Greet, W. Cabell.—World words, recommended pronunciations. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, for the Columbia Broadcasting System, 1944. Pp. viii + 402. \$3.00.

Johnson, Carl L.—Professor Longfellow of Harvard. *Eugene*: U. of Oregon Press, 1944. Pp. xii + 112. (U. of Ore. Monographs: Lit. and Philol. 5.)

Le Comte, Edward S.—Endymion in England: the literary history of a Greek myth. *New York*: King's Crown Press, 1944. Pp. xiv + 189. \$2.25.

Longaker, Mark.—Ernest Dowson. *Philadelphia*: U. of Penn. Press, 1944. Pp. xii + 282. \$4.00.

Matthews, William.—English pronunciation and shorthand in the early modern period. *Berkeley and Los Angeles*: U. of Calif. Press, 1943. Pp. iv + 135-213. \$0.75. (U. of Calif. Pub. in Eng., IX, 3, pp. 135-214.)

Mineka, Francis E., ed.—The dissidence of dissent: the monthly repository, 1806-1838. *Chapel Hill*: U. of North Carolina Press, 1944. Pp. xiv + 458. \$4.00.

Pane, Remigio Ugo.—English translations from the Spanish, 1484-1943: a bibliography. *New Brunswick*: Rutgers U. Press, 1944. Pp. vi + 218. \$2.50. (Rutgers U. Studies in Span., 2.)

Peyre, Henri.—Writers and their critics: a study in misunderstanding. *Ithaca*: Cornell U. Press, 1944. Pp. xiv + 340. \$3.00.

Ruggles, Eleanor.—Gerard Manley Hopkins: a life. *New York*: W. W. Norton, 1944. Pp. 305. \$3.50.

Schoen, Max, ed.—The enjoyment of the arts. *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1944. Pp. 336. \$5.00.

Schubert, Leland.—Hawthorne, the artist:

fine-art devices in fiction. *Chapel Hill*: U. of North Carolina Press, 1944. Pp. xii + 181. \$3.50.

Sprague, Arthur Colby.—Shakespeare and the actors: the stage business in his plays (1660-1905). *Cambridge, Mass.*: Harvard U. Press, 1944. Pp. xxvi + 440. \$5.00.

Steele, Richard.—Tracts and pamphlets by Richard Steele. Ed. Rae Blanchard. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins U. Press, 1944. Pp. xviii + 663. \$5.50.

Templin, Ernest H.—The social approach to literature. *Berkeley and Los Angeles*: U. of Calif. Press, 1944. Pp. ii + 24. \$0.25. (U. of Calif. Pub. in Mod. Philol., xxviii, 1, pp. 1-24.)

Wade, Gladys I.—Thomas Traherne. *Princeton*: Princeton U. Press, 1944. Pp. x + 269. \$3.00.

Walpole, Horace.—Correspondence with Mary and Agnes Berry and Barbara Cecilia Seton. Ed. W. S. Lewis, A. Dayle Wallace, Charles H. Bennett, and Edwine M. Martz. *New Haven*: Yale U. Press, 1944. 2 Vols.: I, pp. liv + 378; II, pp. x + 402. \$15.00. (Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence. Ed. W. S. Lewis, XI, XII.)

Wolfe, Don M., ed.—Leveller manifestoes of the Puritan revolution. *New York*: Nelson, 1944. Pp. xvi + 440. \$5.00.

Wolle, Francis.—Fitz-James O'Brien: a literary Bohemian of the eighteen-fifties. *Boulder*: U. of Colo. Press, 1944. Pp. xii + 309. \$2.00. (U. of Colo. Studies, Series B., Humanities, II, 2.)

FRENCH

Axelrad, Jacob.—Anatole France, a life without illusions, 1844-1924. *New York*: Harper, 1944. xii + 480 pp.

Carter, J. H.—A Study of Social Problems in the Novels of Paul Bourget with reference to those of Balzac's *Comédie humaine*. Abstract of U. of Ill. diss., 1944. 11 pp.

Chevalier, Michel.—Lettres sur l'Amérique du nord. Extraits. Introd. par R. G. Mahieu. *Princeton*: Princeton U. Press, 1944. xx + 51 pp. \$0.50. (Inst. fr. de Wash.)

Corneille.—L'Illusion comique, ed. J. Marks. *Manchester, Eng.*: Manchester U. Press, 1944. xxviii + 125 pp. 4/6.

Ellebaut.—Anticlaudien, a thirteenth-century French adaptation of the Anticlaudianus of Alain de Lille. Catholic U. diss., 1944. viii + 172 pp.

Hugo, V.—Les Feuilles d'automne, ed. L. Bisson. *Oxford*: Blackwell, 1944. xxiv + 126 pp. 6 s.

Maurois, André.—La Machine à lire les pensées, ed. E. P. Shaw and C. W. Colman. *New York*: T. Y. Crowell, 1944. xvi + 175 pp.

Mirman Contastin, M. — Anthologie littéraire illustrée de la langue fr. 3 v. *La Coruña, Sevilla*: Edit.: el autor, 1943.

Nykl, A. R. — Troubadour Studies, a critical survey of recent books published in this field. *Cambridge, Mass.*: 1944. 20 pp.

Pierre d'Abernun of Fetcham. — *Le Secré de Secrez*, ed. O. A. Beckerlegge. *Oxford*: Blackwell, 1944. Iviii + 94 pp. 30 s.

Podgurski, J. C. — The Evolution of Latin *Finis* in Old French. Abridgment of N. Y. U. diss., 1944. 19 pp.

Racine. — Principes de la tragédie en marge de la Poétique d'Aristote, ed. E. Vinaver. *Manchester, Eng.*: U. of Manchester, 1944. 79 pp. 6/-.

Spitzer, Leo. — L'amour lointain de Jaufré Rudel et le sens de la poésie des troubadours. *Chapel Hill*: U. of N. C., 1944. 74 pp. (U. of N. C. Studies in the Romance L. and L., 5.)

SPANISH

Alfonso X, El Sabio. — Antología por Carmen Castro. *Madrid*: Eds. FE., 1944. 207 pp.

Asín Palacios, M. — Glosario de voces romances registradas por un botánico anónimo hispano-musulmán (siglos XI-XII). *Madrid*: Investigaciones Científicas, 1943. liv + 420 pp.

Ballagás, E. — Antología de poesía Negra Hispanoamericana. *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1944. 290 pp.

Calderón. — Obra lírica, ed. Manuel de Montoliu. *Barcelona*: Montaner y Simón, 1943. 194 pp.

Campoamor. — Poesías, ed. Félix Ros. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1943. 308 pp.

Díaz-Plaja, G. (ed.). — Leyendas románticas esp. *Barcelona*: Edit. Olimpo, 1943. 235 pp.

Eoff and King. — Spanish American Short Stories. *New York*: Macmillan, 1944. xx + 204 pp. \$1.60.

Góngora. — Poesías escogidas, ed. Manuel de Montoliu. *Barcelona*: Montaner y Simón, 1943. xxxvi + 216 pp.

González Martínez, E. (ed.). — Antología poética. *Buenos Aires*: Espasa-Calpe, 1943. 154 pp.

Jarrett, Edith M. — Sal y sabor de México. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1944. xiv + 194 pp. \$1.48.

Maeztu, María de. — Antología. Siglo XX. *Prosistas Esp.* *Buenos Aires*: Espasa-Calpe, 1943. 279 pp.

Méndez Pereira, O. — Balboa, ed. E. W. Hesse. *New York*: American Bk. Co., 1944. xiv + 254 pp. \$1.60.

Miacollània Fabra. — Recull de treballs de lingüística catalana i romànica. *Buenos Aires*: "Coni," 1943. viii + 401 pp.

Quevedo. — Obras completas, ed. Luis Astrana Marín. *Madrid*: Edit. M. Aguilar, 1943. lxix + 1637 pp.

Ramírez Cabañas. — Antología de Cuentos mexicanos (1875-1910). *Buenos Aires*: Espasa-Calpe, 1943. 153 pp.

Seps, S. B. — Visitamos la Habana. *New York*: Harper, 1944. xv + 207 pp. \$1.28.

Tornos, Alberto de. — Combined Spanish Method. *New York*: Grosset, 1943. xxix + 515 pp. \$1.49.

Vélez de Guevara. — El Conde don Pedro Vélez y don Sancho el Deseado, ed. crítica de R. H. Olmsted. *Minneapolis*: U. of Minn. Press, 1944. viii + 189 pp. \$2.50.

Walsh, D. D. — Seis relatos americanos. *New York*: Norton, 1943. 242 pp. \$1.65.

PORTUGUESE

Agard, Willis, and Lobo. — Brazilian Portuguese from Thought to Word. *Princeton*: Princeton U. Press, 1944. xviii + 277 pp. \$3.00.

Cossío, J. M. de. — El Soneto portugués, antol. y trad. *Madrid*: Eds. Atlas, 1943. xii + 177 pp.

GENERAL

Harsh, P. W. — A Handbook of Classical Drama. *Stanford*: Stanford U. Press, 1944. xii + 526 pp. \$4.00.

Hughes, Muriel J. — Women Healers in Medieval Life and Literature. *New York*: King's Crown Press, 1943. 180 pp. \$2.00.

Kernodle, G. R. — From Art to Theatre. Form and Convention in the Renaissance. *Chicago*: U. of Chicago Press, 1944. x + 255 pp. \$5.00.

Manning, C. A. — Ukrainian Literature, studies of leading authors. *Jersey City*: Ukrainian National Ass., 1944. 126 pp.

Rider, Freemont. — The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library. *New York*: Hadham Press, 1944. xvi + 236 pp. \$4.00.

Roback, A. A. — A Dictionary of International Slurs (Ethnophaulisms). *Cambridge, Mass.*: Sci-Art Pubs., 1944. 394 pp. \$6.25.

Thomson, S. H. — Progress of Medieval and Renaissance Studies in the U. S. and Canada. Bulletin 18. *Boulder*: U. of Colorado, 1944. 125 pp. \$0.75.

Schild, R., H. Bergman, P. Lagerkvist, R. Josephson. — Scandinavian Plays [translated], introd. by Alrik Gustafson. *Princeton*: Princeton U. Press for Am.-Scan. Foundation, 1944. 176 pp. \$2.00.

Studies in Speech and Drama in Honor of Alexander M. Drummond. *Ithaca*: Cornell U. Press, 1944. viii + 472 pp.

1944

Luis
Milar,

entos
ires:

New
28.

anish
ix +

Pedro
ftica
Minn.

anos.
5.

illian
ince-
277

gués,
. xii

sical
944.

s in
ork:

0.
atre.

nce.
x +

ture,
ity:

the
ork:

00.

ter-
am-

pp.

and
ada.

944.

, R.
ans-

nce-

can.

or of
nell

Luis
Bar.

tos
es:

ew
ish
+

dro
ica
nn.

OS.

an
ce-
77

és,
xii

al
4.

in
22

e.
e.
+

29

10

1

1

45

1

11

1

Brazilian Portuguese

FROM THOUGHT TO WORD

by *Frederick B. Agard,
Raymond S. Willis, Jr.
and Helio Lobo*

THE NOVEL, analytical method used so successfully in Willis and Agard's *Spanish from Thought to Word* is employed again in this new grammar. Recommended as a manual of instruction as well as a reference book for commercial purposes. \$3.00

CONTAINS:

- New official Brazilian spelling, approved in 1943.
- English-Portuguese, Portuguese-English vocabulary of 2,000 entries!
- Guide to pronunciation
- Historical sketch of Brazilian Portuguese
- Tables of verbs and pronouns

EACH CHAPTER CONTAINS:

- Analysis
- Illustrative material
- Vocabularies
- Exercises

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

Princeton, New Jersey



TRACTS AND PAMPHLETS

BY
RICHARD STEELE

EDITED WITH NOTES AND COMMENTARY

By **RAE BLANCHARD**

Professor of English, Goucher College

The reputation of Sir Richard Steele as a man of letters is secure in his essays and plays, and as promoter and editor of the influential *Tatler*, *Spectator*, and *Guardian*, his contribution to English social development is admittedly great. But his achievement in public life is commonly underrated, and one aspect of his journalism, his work as publicist and pamphleteer during the crucial years of the early eighteenth century, all but forgotten. For one reason his pamphlets are difficult of access. Although there were reissues of several at the close of the century, they are now rare in these as well as the earlier forms, and there has been no modern edition. For the first time, here in one volume are gathered together the thirty—or so—pieces constituting his known writings as a pamphleteer. In this collected edition, each one is accompanied by an introductory note outlining the occasion, a separate bibliography describing the various editions and translations, and a statement of the variant readings in the text.

It is in these tracts and pamphlets that the integrity of Steele's public life becomes clear. Touching as they do upon all important issues then before the English public, they are nevertheless unified by his passionate adherence to the principles of the Revolution of 1688—constitutional monarchy, religious toleration, personal and parliamentary liberty. The views presented in them are, of course, those of a Whig speaking his mind, but of one who is a moderate—objective and fair; in expression they are characteristic of Steele's liveliness and good temper. The modern reader hears in them a voice speaking sturdily in behalf of matters of perennial concern.

xvii + 663 pages, 29 facsimiles. Octavo. \$5.50.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND

A NEW MILITARY READER

L'Armée moderne

By CHARLES A. MICAUD

U. S. Military Academy, West Point

Gives an up-to-date description of a modern army in training, on maneuvers, and in actual combat during the present war.

Recent developments in military practice are discussed and important new arms such as airborne infantry and armored units are emphasized. Accounts of the Central Tunisian campaign and of a hypothetical invasion of Europe conclude the text.

Topics for discussion and lists of questions to aid conversation practice follow each chapter. *Ready in November.*

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON



ANNOUNCING PUBLICATION

in December

of the first two titles in

THE HOLT SPOKEN LANGUAGE SERIES

SPOKEN GERMAN—Moulton & Moulton

COLLOQUIAL DUTCH—Bloomfield

These texts are identical with those prepared for the United States Armed Forces Institute by the Linguistic Society of America and the Intensive Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

257 Fourth Avenue

New York 10, New York